

HUMANISTICA LOVANIENSIA

JOURNAL OF NEO-LATIN STUDIES

Vol. XXXVII-1988



LEUVEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

HUMANISTICA LOVANIENSIA
Journal of Neo-Latin Studies

Editorial Board

Editors:

Prof. Dr. Jozef IJsewijn (K.U.Leuven-Belgium); Prof. Dr. Gilbert Tournoy (K.U.Leuven); Prof. Dr. Constant Matheeuissen (UFSAL Brussel); Prof. Dr. Dirk Sacré (UFSIA Antwerpen).

Associate Editors:

Prof. em Dr. Leonard Forster (Cambridge); Prof. Charles Fantazzi (Windsor-Ontario); †Prof. Dr. Veljko Gortan (Zagreb); Prof. Dr. M. Miglio (Viterbo); Prof. Dr. Fred Nichols (New York); Prof. Dr. Jan Öberg (Stockholm); Mgr. Dr. José Ruyschaert (Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana); Prof. Dr. Lidia Winniczuk (Warszawa); Prof. Dr. D. Wuttke (Bamberg).

Editorial Assistants:

Drs. Marcus De Schepper; Mrs J. IJsewijn-Jacobs; Dr. Godelieve Tournoy-Thoen.

*

Volume 1 through 16 were edited by the late Mgr. Henry de Vocht from 1928 to 1961 as a series of monographs on the history of humanism at Louvain, especially in the *Collegium Trilingue*. These volumes are obtainable in a reprint edition.

Beginning with volume 17 (1968) HUMANISTICA LOVANIENSIA appears annually as a *Journal of Neo-Latin Studies*.

Orders for separate volumes and standing orders should be sent to the publisher: *Leuven University Press*, Krakenstraat 3, B-3000 Leuven (Belgium)

Librarians who wish for an exchange with *Humanistica Lovaniensia* should apply to the Librarian of the University Library of Leuven (K.U.L.): Dr. J. Roegiers, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Ladeuzeplein 22, B-3000 Leuven (Belgium).

Manuscripts for publication should be submitted (2 ex.) to a member of the editorial board. They should follow the prescriptions of the *MHRA Style Book*, published by W.S. Maney, Hudson Road, Leeds LS9 7DL, England.

Contributors will receive twenty offprints of their articles free of charge.

Address of the Editors: Seminarium Philologiae Humanisticae, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Faculteitsgebouw Letteren en Wijsbegeerte, Blijde-Inkomststraat 21, B-3000 Leuven (Belgium).

HUMANISTICA LOVANIENSIA

**HUMANISTICA
LOVANIENSIA**

JOURNAL OF NEO-LATIN STUDIES

Vol. XXXVII-1988



LEUVEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

*Gepubliceerd met de steun
van de Universitaire Stichting van België
en van het Ministerie van de Vlaamse Gemeenschap*

© 1988 Universitaire Pers Leuven / Leuven University Press / Presses Universitaires de Louvain, Krakenstraat, 3 - B 3000 Leuven/Louvain, Belgium

Niets uit deze uitgave mag worden veeleelvoudigd en/of openbaar gemaakt door middel van druk, fotokopie, microfilm of op welke andere wijze ook zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de uitgever.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission from the publisher.

ISBN 90 6186 294 9
D/1988/1869/32

CONSPECTUS RERUM

1. Textus et Studia.

Martin C. DAVIES, <i>An Enigma and a Phantom: Giovanni Aretino and Giacomo Languschi</i>	1
Terence O. TUNBERG, <i>The Latinity of Lorenzo Valla's Gesta Ferdinandi regis Aragonum</i>	30
C. Joachim CLASSEN, <i>Cicero Orator inter Germanos redivivus</i>	79
Harry VREDEVELD, <i>Towards a Definitive Edition of Erasmus' Poetry</i>	115
Judith Rice HENDERSON, <i>Despauterius' Syntaxis (1509). The Earliest Publication of Erasmus' De Conscribendis Epistolis</i>	175
John N. GRANT, <i>Pietro Bembo and Vat. lat. 3226</i>	211
John MARTYN, <i>The Relationship between Lúcio Ângelo André de Resende and Johannes Secundus</i>	244
Gilbert TOURNOY, <i>The Unrecorded Poetical Production of Andreas Ammonius</i>	255

2. Miscellanea.

Harry VREDEVELD, <i>The Word "Anormis" in Erasmus' De Praeparatione ad Mortem</i>	265
Frank LEYS, <i>L'Hecastus de Macropedius et le "Landjuweel" de Gand (1539)</i>	267
Frank LEYS, <i>Note sur la biographie de Jacques Yetzweirt</i>	269
Jozef IJSEWIJN, <i>Traiectum Superius = Maastricht (Ad J. Cochlaeum, Germ. VIII 27)</i>	272

3. Instrumentum Criticum: *Castigationes Erasimianae IX* 273

4. Nuntii 276

5. Instrumentum bibliographicum:

Jozef IJsewijn, Gilbert Tournoy, Marcus de Schepper, Dirk Sacré, <i>Instrumentum bibliographicum neolatinum 1987-88</i>	278
---	-----

6. Instrumentum lexicographicum 326

7. Indices

– Index codicum manuseriptorum	328
– Index nominum	329

M. C. DAVIES

AN ENIGMA AND A PHANTOM:
GIOVANNI ARETINO AND GIACOMO LANGUSCHI

This paper aims to illustrate the background of two letters of Leonardo Bruni Aretino, IV.18 and IV.20 Mehus, and thereby to add to the stock of knowledge concerning some of his associates in the 1420s. In particular, it means to shed light on the person of Giovanni Aretino, “the first professional scribe” in the new humanistic script¹, and recently termed an enigma who veers between (archival) fact and (archivists’) imagination². Beyond this I collect scattered and often conflicting information towards the biography of a figure who stood on the margins of early humanism, Giacomo Languschi, in the hope that further, more systematic researches in Italian archives may give him more substance. The evidence is, as ever, fragmentary and difficult to integrate, but a certain undergrowth of inveterate misconception can be pruned back along the way, and certain problems posed afresh.

We start with a text, a letter sent by Bruni to one Iohanninus.

Leonardus s. d. Johannino

Tris epistolas tuas unum fere sub tempus accepi; quibus antequam respondeo, iuvat praefari atque praemonere, ea videlicet ipsa quae meus erga te amor ac patriae caritas exposcit. Multum igitur hoc brevi tempore quo a nobis abfuisti te profecisse statuo; siquidem in tanta civitate recentem adhuc et modo advenam nonnulli praestantes viri in familiaritatem susceperunt, quorum gratiam tuere quaeso diligenter atque annitere ut eos bene promerendo in amorem tuum quam maxime vertas. Id si tu quemadmodum spero assequare, quod tandem

¹ R. W. Hunt, “Humanistic Script in Florence in the Early Fifteenth Century”, in *Calligraphy and Palaeography: Essays Presented to Alfred Fairbank* (London 1965), pp. 272-274 at 273.

² G. Nicolaj Petronio, “Per la soluzione di un enigma: Giovanni Aretino copista, notaio e cancelliere”, *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 30 (1981), 1-12; L. Miglio, “Giovanni Aretino tra realtà e immaginazione”, *Atti e mem. Accad. Petrarca d’Arezzo* 45 (1982), 372-378.

lucrum cum hoc lucro existimem comparandum? Illud praeterea moneo, ut istic degens conquiescere animo velis, nec eorum quae hic reliquisti desiderio torqueri. Quod nisi feceris, nichil de te laudabile unquam praestabis. Quid enim cor anxium et moerens exhibere aut sibi ipsi aut alteri potest? Cogita igitur non tam domesticos quam impias tuorum molestias domi reliquisse; urbem autem nunc incolere opulentissimam, ornatissimam et in qua nichil molestiarum insit, nisi forte quas tu ipse stulta mollicie tibi ultro suggereris.

Haec ego quae sentiebam de personis et urbe commonefacienda putavi. Nunc venio ad epistolas tuas. Mea nescioquae istic reperta quod admirarere, quodque a ceteris ea laudari praedicas, aiunt fortasse homines:

sed non ego credulus illis:

Nam neque me Varo videor, neque dicere Cinna

Digna sed argutos inter strepere anser olores.

De epistolis autem quas aliorum voluminibus insertas deprehendisti, ne fer quaeso tu id quidem moleste. Satis michi honoris ille quisquis fuerit meis detulit, quod inter suas quas bonas putavit collocare dignatus est. Commentaria vero primi belli Punici quae flagitas, ad te propediem transmittam.

Quod autem me consulis de re illa tua, michi una salus videtur ut fortem nunc te constantemque praestes, etsi scio quam difficile sit non flecti animo, presertim tibi qui es natura mollissimus. Sed tamen, ut mea fert opinio, aut nichil unquam aut taciturnitas tua illorum vesaniam refringet, errantesque et devios in orbitam reducet. Quod si indices te pati non posse, eludent. Vale. Florentiae³.

A Giovannino, then, bound to Bruni by *patriae caritas*, regarded by him as mentally or morally fragile (*natura mollissimus*), a recent arrival in an *urbs opulentissima* where he enjoys the friendship of *praestantes viri*. The diffident suggestion of F. P. Luiso that Bruni's compatriot was Giovanni Tortelli of Arezzo seems to have hardened over the years and won general acceptance⁴. Mariangela Regoliosi raised in passing the

³ Bruni, *Epistolarum libri VIII*, rec. L. Mehus (Florence 1741), I p. 131, *ep.* IV.18. I have altered *quos hic reliquisti* in the first paragraph to *quae...* on the basis of manuscript readings noted in L. Bertalot's copy of the Mehus edition, of which Lucia Gualdo Rosa kindly supplied a photocopy. Bertalot remarked in print that the opening word should read with the manuscripts not *Tres* but the "sprachliche Besonderheit" *Tris* (*Studien zum italienischen und deutschen Humanismus*, II, Rome 1975, p. 389). In Bruni's quotation of Vergil (*Eclogues* IX.34ff.) modern editions read *nam neque adhuc Vario videor nec dicere Cinna*. The date of the letter, early 1420s, is more precisely defined below.

⁴ *Studi su l'epistolario di Leonardo Bruni* a c. di L. Gualdo Rosa (Rome 1980), p. 99 n. 82. The identification has been accepted by e.g. H. Baron, *Yearbook of Italian Studies* 1 (1971), 69, M. and E. Cecchini, *Leonardo Bruni: La versione del Pluto di Aristofane* (Florence 1965), p. x, and Regoliosi (as next note). A dissenting voice is R. Ribouli, "Spunti filologici dall'epistolario di Francesco Filelfo", in *Francesco Filelfo nel quinto*

possibility that the wealthy city in question was Venice, but disproved Tortelli's supposed connection with that town by showing that the signed manuscripts of Ioannes Arretinus from Venice of 1422-23 are the work of the well-known scribe of that name⁵. There is indeed no known association of Tortelli with Venice; what little is known of his early life suggests study in the 1420s at Mantua, Bologna and Florence⁶. But the words remain, and they do strongly point to Venice. Bruni was all too familiar with the dilapidated state of Rome after the Schism — he must have made a conscious decision not to go there when Martin V left Florence in 1420 — and he would hardly have recommended a Naples in the grip of factional strife or a Milan with which Florence was on the point of going to war. Appearances can be saved by dropping Tortelli altogether from the picture and replacing him by the same Giovanni Aretino whose work once passed for Tortelli's.

Ser Giovanni di Cenni d'Arezzo has come in for much attention recently, with the uncovering of documents written by him in Arezzo and Florence. Nicolaj Petronio has demonstrated that the hand of this notary, chancellor of the commune of Arezzo in 1410-11, is identifiable with that of the famous scribe in his more cursive script, and Luisa Miglio has reproduced (without transcribing) an interesting autograph letter written from Florence in January 1418 to Giuliano de' Medici, when the latter was in Venice⁷. Giovanni's presence in Florence is documented by his signed and dated manuscripts from 1410 to 1417, and he will have written some unsigned books there for the Medici after that date. Acquaintance, even intimacy, with the Florentine humanists can be inferred from the script and contents of his productions; most clearly perhaps from Escorial MS N.III.7, the dedication copy of Bruni's translation of Plato's *Gorgias*, written about 1410. Giovanni wrote the first few leaves, Niccolò Niccoli the rest, and Poggio, the originator of the script of which Giovanni was an early and accomplished practitio-

centenario della morte, (Padua 1986), pp. 160-161, where these conclusions are in part anticipated.

⁵ "Nuove ricerche intorno a Giovanni Tortelli", *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 12 (1969), 130-131. B. L. Ullman, *The Origin and Development of Humanistic Script* (Rome 1960), p. 95 n. 6, attributed to Tortelli two MSS now certainly known to be the work of Giovanni Aretino. I give in Appendix 2 a list of his MSS which brings up to date the lists of Ullman, pp. 91-95 and Nicolaj Petronio (as n. 2), pp. 6-7.

⁶ Regoliosi, "Nuove ricerche", pp. 134-135, and cf. n. 17 below.

⁷ Cf. n. 2. Giovanni's letter is published in Appendix 1 below.

ner, supplied the preface and headings⁸. In time our scribe apparently came to work exclusively for the Medici, and several of his manuscripts can be matched with ones recorded in the March 1418 inventory of their private library, including a Suetonius just sent which is now identified as Laur. 64.4⁹. His copying for Cosimo of the new Cicero speeches found by Poggio in 1417 can be assigned with some confidence to mid-1418¹⁰.

We move now with Giovanni to Venice, where three manuscripts were written by him in the years 1422-23, and two other Venetian manuscripts, nos. 26 and 30 in Appendix 2, presumably fall within the same period. No. 26 (Laur. 79.11, finished on 30 August of an unspecified year), is a copy of a work which he had already written out for Cosimo at Florence (in Laur. 79.7, no. 20), Bruni's translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. A Cicero miscellany now in the Franciscan convent of Imotski, Yugoslavia, was expressly made for Francesco and Ermolao Barbaro, uncle and nephew, in May-June 1422¹¹. Francesco's hand has been detected in the margins of another manuscript from Venice, Vat. lat. 3237, dated 25 December 1422, which is an early witness to the newly-discovered *De Oratore* and *Orator* of Cicero¹². The annotations of another leading Venetian patrician of humanist inclinations, Leonardo Giustiniani, have been seen in the metrical collection of British Library,

⁸ A. C. de la Mare, *The Handwriting of Italian Humanists* I.1 (Oxford 1973), pp. 53-54, and "Humanistic Script: the First Ten Years" in F. Krafft and D. Wuttke (edd.), *Das Verhältnis der Humanisten zum Buch* (Boppard 1977), p. 102 and plate 7a. Laur. 48.11, no. 12 in Appendix 2, was completed by him after earlier work by Poggio and Niccoli. Some unsigned manuscripts possibly attributable to Giovanni after 1440 are listed by Dr de la Mare in "New Researches on Humanistic Scribes in Florence" in A. Garzelli, *Miniatura fiorentina del Rinascimento, 1440-1525*, I (Florence 1985), p. 425 n. 17 and 541 App. 1.71. I have not included these "possibles" in Appendix 2.

⁹ No. 16 in Appendix 2. See F. Pintor, *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 3 (1960), 199. For identification of other surviving MSS with inventory items see Ullman's list (as n. 5).

¹⁰ See *Bodleian Library record* XI.4 (1984), 253-258 on the history of D'Orville 78, no. 17 in Appendix 2.

¹¹ Regoliosi, "Nuove ricerche" p. 133 and plate XII.1 gives the colophon of f. 222'.

¹² J. J. G. Alexander, A. C. de la Mare, *The Italian Manuscripts of Major J. R. Abbey* (London 1969), p. xxiv n. 4, P. Scarcia Piacentini, "La tradizione laudense di Cicerone ed un inesplorato manoscritto della Biblioteca Vaticana (Vat. lat. 3237)", *Revue d'histoire des textes* 11 (1981), 123-146; see pp. 138-139 for the interpretation of the date, "VIII Kl. Ian. MCCCCXXII Salvatoris anno". Poggio wrote to Niccoli about Barbaro's interest in the find at Lodi (which included *Brutus*) in a letter of 12 June 1422: *Poggio Bracciolini: Lettere a Niccolò Niccoli a c. di H. Harth* (Florence 1984), p. 56, ep. 18 (= Tonelli ep. I.21). Richard Hunt long ago pointed out that "If Giovanni Aretino had been available, we should have expected him to receive the important commission of copying this new classical text" for Cosimo, which in the event was written by Giacomo Curlo ("Humanistic Script", as n. 1, p. 273).

Harl. 5248, dated Venice, 15 May 1423¹³. These two, then, — the men that Guarino called “rei publicae Venetae duo lumina”¹⁴ — are strong candidates for identification as the *praestantes viri* whose protection Giovanni enjoys in the *urbs opulentissima*. At the time of Bruni’s letter, the recipient is “recentem adhuc et modo advenam” in the city. Most manuscripts date the letter “II Kl. Feb. MCCCCXXI”, that is, 31 January 1422 in the common style¹⁵, which is concordant with the known scribal activity of Giovanni Aretino at Venice.

Of the reasons for his removal from Florence to Venice we have no direct knowledge, but it is clear that he left behind in Florence a troubled domestic situation. Bruni, with an air of paternal reproof, urges him not to give way to idle regrets and attempts to strengthen his weak character with some plain speaking. It happens that the scribe is mentioned again in humanist correspondence in conveniently similar terms: Traversari to Niccoli, *ep.* VIII.29 of 29 August 1424¹⁶: “Hodie mecum diutius fuit Ioannes Arretinus librarius, multaque invicem contulimus. Sed ea tibi reservo dum coram aderis. Levis est ut solet; sed eum dimittamus”. Bruni’s indecisive correspondent can scarcely be the Tortelli who has no known connexion with Florence before, at the earliest, 1427¹⁷, but rather the *levis librarius* who turns up there again in

¹³ A. G. Watson, *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts in the British Library* (London 1979), I, p. 145 no. 827, on Dr de la Mare’s authority.

¹⁴ *Ep.* 79.16 Sabbadini, October 1417.

¹⁵ Two sources give MCCCCXVI, a misreading of -XXI which is ruled out by the contents. A Berlin manuscript, lat. oct. 125, has MCCCCXXII (Luiso, *Studi*, p. 99 n. 83). Baron changed his mind three times over the date, depending on the case he had to argue: *Leonardo Bruni Aretino, humanistisch-philosophische Schriften* (Leipzig 1928), p. 207 (“1422 oder 1423”); *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance* ed. 1 (Princeton 1955), p. 611ff. (“1421”); *Yearbook* (as n. 4), p. 69 (“1422 [possibly 1423]”); finally settling on “January 1421, in accordance with the indication in the best manuscripts”, *Speculum* 56 (1981), p. 836. In general Bruni seems not to have dated his personal letters by year. Of those letters from Florence which are given years in some MSS, Luiso thought that IV.4M (= IV.4 Luiso) and X.9M (= VII.10 Luiso) were in Florentine style (though the latter has been disputed by E. Fumagalli, *Aevum* 56 (1982), p. 347 n. 15) and the only other relevant case, IX.1M (= IX.2 Luiso), in the common style. It must be recognized that in this area we are often at the mercy of scribes for whom chronological accuracy is not a matter of interest. The onus is on those who would have Florentines writing from Florence in the common style to show that the MSS indicate this with some consistency; both Poggio and Traversari used Florentine style when dating their letters by year, and cf. Baron himself, *Schriften* 207, “wahrscheinlich stil. fior.”.

¹⁶ Dated by Luiso, *Riordinamento dell’epistolario di Ambrogio Traversari*, fasc. 2 (Florence 1899), p. 4.

¹⁷ C. Piana, *Archivum Franciscanum historicum* 53 (1960), pp. 364-365. Bruni did send Tortelli a letter, IX.9 Mehus, c. 1442, when the latter was still a student. Tortelli’s date of

1424. Before passing to the second letter which Bruni sent him, probably in 1425, some earlier testimony needs consideration.

A so far unidentified Iohannes in Bruni *ep.* X.2 Mehus (= III.17 Luiso) may conceivably be our scribe. In 1409 Leonardo wrote to Francesco Pizolpasso: "Quantum vero ad Iohannem amicum tuum, utinam te aut virtute tua dignus foret. Sed quottidie audio nonnulla de ipso quae magno me dolore afficiunt". This shiftless Giovanni has been arrested in Florence for a debt of 25 florins, and Bruni hopes that intercession with *Nicolao nostro* may be of help. This Nicolaus, as appears from the preceding letter¹⁸, is Niccolò de' Ricci, a Florentine for whom we find Giovanni copying one of his first manuscripts, Vat. Pal. lat. 1496, with an extravagantly intimate colophon addressed to the patron¹⁹. That is no more than a remote speculation, but it might be worth examining Pizolpasso's known manuscripts for traces of Giovanni's earliest scribal activity²⁰.

A major addition to our picture of Giovanni Aretino has recently emerged from the Florentine archives. MAP LXXXIX.287 is an autograph letter that he sent to Giuliano di Averardo de' Medici in Venice on 13 January 1418²¹. It consists of an exaggerated, at times almost hysterical, appreciation of Giuliano's infinite virtues, in which Giovanni associates with himself "Jannoçius optimo ingenio adolescens" and "Pierus Pieri illius aequalis". Rich and influential citizens like the Medici could expect many such addresses, though few perhaps as flowery as this one, and they knew how to interpret them. Always underlying these effusions is a request for patronage of some sort. As the Medici *amici* developed into something like an organized party in the later 1420s, they produced a mass of letters still preserved in the Archivio Mediceo avanti il Principato which present claims for assistance and assurances of

birth is not known, but he could describe himself as having been *adolescens* in 1438 (Regoliosi, "Nuove ricerche", p. 142 n. 138), which further tells against his having received this 1422 letter.

¹⁸ Published by Luiso, *Studi*, p. 66, as his *ep.* III.16.

¹⁹ Ullman, *Origin and Development*, pp. 91-92:f. 161v: "Ioannes Arretinus tibi Nicolao Riccio salutes plurimas dicit. Vale. Diu felix mei memor dulcissimas ac suavissimas Romani eloquii epistolas [i.e. Cic. *Fam*] lege feliciter et me ama. Florentiae anno domini MCCCCX Nonis Iuniis indictione tertia. Me ama et vale". (No. 4 in Appendix 2 below).

²⁰ No connexion with Giovanni appears in A. Paredi, *La Biblioteca del Pizolpasso* (Milan 1961), nor in G.D. Jack's Oxford B. Litt. thesis (1976) on the same subject.

²¹ Printed in Appendix 1 from inspection of the original. A photograph of it accompanies Miglio, "Giovanni Aretino" (as n. 2). Her reference to MAP LXXXIX.278 is a misprint.

fidelity²². Presiding over the elaborate network of (broadly political) patronage were precisely those persons to whom Giovanni commends himself: Cosimo and his brother Lorenzo, Averardo and his son Giuliano, with the addition of Nicola di Vieri, distant cousin of Cosimo and friend of Poggio, Niccoli and Bruni²³.

But Giovanni, as seems to have been his destiny, rather missed his mark with Giuliano, who has no reputation as a patron of learning and escapes notice in humanist letters²⁴. He will very likely have been travelling on bank business to Venice, where a branch had been established in 1398 and where the Medici had many friends²⁵. Among them was Francesco Barbaro, who shortly after Giuliano's visit commended him in passing to a Veronese friend resident in Florence²⁶. The nexus between Giovanni's Medici patrons at Florence and the Venetian Barbaro is the obvious mechanism for his passage to Venice, where he produced at least the Imotski Cicero for Francesco and Ermolao in 1422²⁷. This

²² See the interesting analysis of their language and content in D. Kent, *The Rise of the Medici* (Oxford 1978), pp. 83-87.

²³ See Kent 87. For Nicola see e.g. Luiso, *Studi* and P. W. G. Jordan, *Two Renaissance Book Hunters: the Letters of Poggius Bracciolini to Nicolaus de Niccolis* (Columbia 1974), *ad indices*. Giuliano is to pass on Giovanni's compliments "cum aderis", that is, when he has returned from Venice to Florence.

²⁴ But cf. Miglio, "Giovanni Aretino", p. 374, quoting a 1429 letter of Ser Ciao di Pagolo Ciai, who has left Cicero's *Tusculans* for Giuliano and will send a Servius. This was perhaps for the use of Giuliano's son, Francesco, who was then receiving a humanist education from Andrea Fiocchi (later a colleague of Poggio's in the papal secretariat): see G. Mercati, *Ultimi contributi alla storia degli umanisti: Traversariana*, *Studi e Testi* 90 (Vatican City 1939), pp. 101, 111, with further information in D. Kent, "I Medici in esilio", *Archivio Storico Italiano*, 132 (1974), 3-63 at p. 23 n. 73.

²⁵ Cosimo and Lorenzo spent their period of banishment there in 1433-34 (Giuliano himself died in exile at Rome in July 1434). See Kent, *Rise of the Medici*, pp. 305-307, on the Medici connexion with Venice.

²⁶ Barbaro's friendship with the Medici dated from his stay in Florence in 1415: Sabbadini, *Storia e critica di testi latini*, ed. 2 (Padua 1971), pp. 25-35, Miglio, "Giovanni Aretino", pp. 375-376. He specially urges Giannicola Salerno, at that time capitano del popolo at Florence (on whom see my article in *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 33 (1984), 1-21), to cultivate Lorenzo, to whom he was most attached; but also "idem de Giuliano ... dictum velim": *Francisci Barbari epistolae* ed. A. M. Querini (Brescia 1743), p. 24, dated 22 February 1418 by R. Sabbadini, *Epistolario di Guarino*, III (Venice 1919), p. 73. I do not find Giuliano again in Barbaro's correspondence: not in Querini or Sabbadini, *130 lettere di F.B.* (Salerno 1884), nor in the latest additions of Griggio (as n. 58 below) and Calabrese (*Archivio Veneto* 113 (1982), 1-55); nor elsewhere among the humanists.

²⁷ If the dedication copy to Ambrogio Traversari of the Aesop translation made by Ermolao somewhere survives, it might well be in Giovanni's hand: the colophon of Brit. Lib. Add. 33782, a Veronese copy of the third quarter of the century, gives the date 1 October 1422.

passage must now be placed in 1421, but precise information is as yet lacking.

Whatever Giuliano thought of this missive, which reads in places like an invitation to launch a coup d'état, any sensitive reader must have been repelled by its combination of grievous latinity and inordinate hyperbole, another mark of Giovanni's waywardness of judgement. It abounds in such unhappy phrases as *nullo reliquo* (nullo alio), *et in se et in nullis* (apparently for: *nec in se nec in ullis*), *orationis capillos* (nervos), *animus in illum regius* (in illo), *nimum forsani dixi*, *nedum plura mihi dicenda sint* (licet), *ad haec te adhortari ... gliscunt* (concupiscunt). With the evidence of the new letter before us, we can scarcely continue to call Giovanni Aretino a "persona colta, che talvolta interviene sul testo [of Cicero] dandone una 'lettura critica'"²⁸, or one "che conosceva il greco"²⁹; a more realistic assessment is Giovanni's own self-appraisal, "homini parum in litteris erudito". A positive gain, however, is to find the young Giannozzo Manetti (and beside him Piero di Piero, a *cartolaio*)³⁰ associated at this early date with a humanistic scribe and the *optima studia humanitatis*. This must have been at the very outset of his studies, for Vespasiano da Bisticci has Manetti (b. 1396) prevented from following his natural studious bent by parental pressure until he reached the age of 25³¹. A last trace of our scribe at work may perhaps be seen in a letter of Niccolò Luna, a friend of Manetti and warm admirer of Bruni. Niccolò writes to one "Iohanni" that while he is aware that his correspondent is involved in domestic business of his 'patronus', he would very much like to know if a Sallust given for copying four months previously has been completed. The piece, like most of Luna's epistles in this collection, is undated, but it immediately follows one of 1434; this happens, incidentally, to be the date at which Filelfo set his *Commentationes de exilio* where Bruni, Manetti and Luna are shown in

²⁸ Scarcia Piacentini, "La tradizione laudense", p. 141.

²⁹ Nicolaj Petronio, "Per la soluzione", p. 6. Scarcia Piacentini herself rejects this view (p. 142), which goes back to Ullman, *Origin and Development*, p. 96.

³⁰ He became one of the Priors of September 1434 who oversaw the return of the Medici to Florence: Kent, *Rise of the Medici*, p. 328 n. 162. His profession of stationer sits well with Giovanni's as a scribe.

³¹ Vespasiano da Bisticci, *Le Vite* ed. A. Greco, II (Florence 1976), p. 519. Miglio fails to mention "Jannoçius", whom I do not doubt to be Manetti, later Bruni's closest disciple. Manetti came to own the Cicero letters by Giovanni mentioned at n. 19 above, as well as the Cicero speeches, Vat. Pal. lat. 1486, of which Giovanni copied the last part (no. 25 in Appendix 2).

conversation with others. The Giovanni in Luna's letter too needs, or at least gets, some mental stiffening. From chasing up an order for a book, the letter turns rather surprisingly to exhortations to bear with the blows of fortune: "Quod si tu ipse sic existimare volueris, nec paupertas nec penuria nec dura servitus e statu tuo mentem tuam deiecerint. Igitur animo forti magnoque sis ut te quoque tacito literarum ocio dedere possis". All this suits what we know of Giovanni Aretino, though the identification must remain for now uncertain³². Surer information comes from Bruni's second letter.

* * *

"Nimium forsán dixi" wrote Giovanni to Giuliano, and Bruni in *ep.*IV.18 counsels "taciturnitas" as a remedy for his personal problems — the nature of which is not disclosed. We encounter further garrulousness on Giovanni's part in the other letter which Bruni sent him, IV.20 Mehus. This is addressed simply to "Iohanni", but the contents tie the two letters together, and no one has doubted that they are directed to the same person. They both mention (and so does the intervening *ep.*IV.19 to Pileo dei Marini) Bruni's *Commentaria primi belli Punici*, commentaries based on Polybius which Giovanni had requested at the time of *ep.*IV.18, and on which he had passed comments at the time of *ep.*IV.20³³. The conjunction naturally leads one to suppose that the latter, undated in the manuscripts, lies close to the first letter of 31 January 1422. But Hans Baron exposed a difficulty³⁴.

*Ep.*IV.20 bears witness to a work built, Bruni insists, on firm Aristotelian foundations, which can only be the *Isagogicon moralis disciplinae*. The *Isagogicon* itself shows Bruni at home reading the *Eudemian Ethics*, a new find of Aurispa which was not announced until August 1424 and

³² The beginning of the letter is quoted, without discussion of the recipient, by A. della Torre, *Storia dell' Accademia platonica di Firenze* (Florence 1902), p. 311 (a reference I owe to Dr de la Mare); it appears in MS Riccard. 1166 f. 40, of which I have seen a microfilm. See della Torre, p. 309 n. 3 for relations of Luna, Manetti and Bruni.

³³ They had been finished by 1419 (Baron in *Speculum* 56 (1981), p. 836). This neither strengthens nor weakens the case for *ep.* IV.18's dating from 1422, despite Baron's arguments there.

³⁴ "The Date of Leonardo Bruni's *Isagogicon moralis disciplinae*", *The Yearbook of Italian Studies* 1 (1971), 64-74, the gist of which is given by Baron, *Speculum* 56 (1981), p. 837 in a review of Luiso's *Studi*.

not sent to Florence before December of that year³⁵. Therefore both the *Isagogicon* — an attempt at harmonizing the ethical thought of the ancient philosophical schools — and *ep.IV.20* must date from 1425 or later. The latter, furthermore, reproduces verbatim a passage from Bruni's preface to his translation of Plato's *Phaedrus* made in 1424³⁶.

At the end of 1425 there reappeared in the Roman Curia the Dominican theologian Andrea Chrysoberges of Pera, known in humanist literature as Andreas Constantinopolitanus. It seems likely, as Luiso says³⁷, that this is the same man against whom Giovanni has feebly defended Bruni's stature as an exponent of moral philosophy: "Quamquam est quidem abs te non satis acute causa mea defensa adversus Constantinopolitanum. Quid enim opus fuit ad Ciceronem allegare hanc quaecunque est in nobis rerum moralium notitiam? Quasi vero Aristoteles ipse ab studio nostro fuerit alienus ...". Bruni's irritation is the more understandable when we recall that it is directed at one who had by this time copied out at least twice his translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics* (p. 4 above). No doubt Chrysoberges is the "rhetorem illum eloquentiae hostem" (in Bruni's paradoxical phrasing earlier in the letter) whose competence to judge in this matter Bruni doubts. A teacher at Padua and orator at Constance before his preaching mission to the Orient in the early 1420s, Chrysoberges will have made his way back to the Curia via Venice, to be engaged there in inept literary discussion by Giovanni Aretino. In 1426 he became the pope's theologian, as *Magister schola-*

³⁵ *Bruni Schriften* (as n. 15), p. 22. On Aurispa's manuscript, see now D. Harlfinger, "Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Eudemischen Ethik", in *Untersuchungen zur E.E.*, ed. P. Moraux, "Peripatoi": Akten des 5. Symposium Aristotelicum (Berlin 1971), pp. 4-6.

³⁶ "Nisi forte Apelles aut Protogenes ... credantur", *Schriften*, p. 127 = "nisi forte Appellem aut Protogenem ... credamus", Mehus I.134-135 (Bruni remembered the anecdote in Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 35.85). One has to be rather careful in deciding what is a quotation and what the original in these matters, because Bruni was much given to self-quotation once he had hit upon an expressive phrase or example. Apelles and Protogenes reappear in *De interpretatione recta* (*Schriften*, p. 83) as the putative painters of the soiled picture which Bruni compares to Aristotle's sufferings at the hands of earlier translators; this image is reused, with Giotto as the painter, in two defences of his *Ethics* translation, *epp.* IV.22 and VII.4. I think one could show from this that *De interpretatione* is likely to be appreciably later than "um 1420" (*Schriften*, pp. 165-166), or even 1426, as argued by Baron in *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance* (Princeton 1955), pp. 615-616 n. 25.

³⁷ *Studi*, p. 100 n. 88, an identification not discussed by Baron. *Andream* may have dropped out of the manuscript tradition of the letter before *Constantinopolitanum* in the following quotation.

rum sacri palatii, and in due course Archbishop successively of Rhodes and of Nicosia, where he died in 1452³⁸.

I am inclined to see Chrysoberges also in the "hominem ut audio magna theologiae scientia sed nullarum penitus litterarum" who is the "praeceptor" of an otherwise unknown Demetrius³⁹ against whom Bruni launched *ep.* IV.22 in defence of some remarks on Aristotle prefixed to his translation of the *Ethics*. Such evidence as we have suggests that by humanist lights this was a fair verdict, for all that the Dominican is later found on amicable terms with Poggio, Filelfo and Bartolomeo Facio⁴⁰. While one cannot derive reliable dates merely from the placing of letters within the *epistolario*, there does seem to be here at the end of Book IV some attempt at forming a rhythm of addressee and content: Iohanninus, the *Commentaria*, Aristotle, friends and the never-failing enemies.

*
* *

A closer look at these letters has added some shading to the emerging

³⁸ L. Gargan, *Lo studio teologico e la biblioteca dei domenicani a Padova nel Tre e Quattrocento* (Padua 1971), p. 59, M.-H. Laurent, *Echos d'Orient* 34 (1935), 414-438, R. Loenertz, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 9 (1939), 1-61 and id. (a compact summary) *ibid.* 45 (1975), 124-128, T. Kaeppli, *Scriptores O.P. Medii Aevi*, I (Rome 1970), pp. 64-67.

³⁹ "... che mi ha tutta l'aria di un giovane frate", Luiso, *Studi*, p. 102 n. 100: not, therefore, the Demetrius of Luiso II.16 (1407) and Mehul III.14 (1410 — nor can *that* Demetrius be Cydones, ob. 1398, as Luiso thought, p. 39 n. 62 and p. 71 n. 80) proposed by A. Birkenmajer ("Der Streit des Alonso von Cartagena mit Leonardo Bruni Aretino", *Vermischte Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Philosophie* (Münster-in-Westfalen 1922, p. 138 n. 1), with some other guesses. The undated letter (c. 1425 from its position) is also printed by C. Marchesi, *L'Etica Nicomachea nella tradizione latina medioevale* (Messina 1904), pp. 50-53.

⁴⁰ The editor of a long Greek letter to Bessarion on a theological topic found it wholly scholastic in character: M. Candal, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 4 (1938), 329-371 at p. 339. Poggio assigned to him the leading part in resolving the debate in his 1429 *De Avaritia*, a part given him "cum sit religiosus" (Poggio Bracciolini: *Lettere a Niccoli*, ed. Harth *ep.* 85.9-10, = Tonelli *ep.* III.32). He was present at Poggio's fiftieth birthday party, 11 February 1430 (*ibid.* 37.60, = Tonelli *ep.* IV.5), but the recipient of his *ep.* X.3 (Tonelli) is not Chrysoberges as Tonelli supposed (cf. G. Mercati, *Ultimi contributi*, p. 102 n. 4). Filelfo was offered by him, but declined, a post in the Curia in 1428 (*Philelphi epistolae familiares* (Venice 1502), f. 7^v, E. Legrand, *Cent-dix lettres grecques de F.F.* (Paris 1892), p. 3 n. 6), and towards the end of his life he sent Facio a letter preserved in two Italian manuscripts, which I have not seen (Kaeppli, *Scriptores O.P.*, p. 67 no. 191). For his leading role in Church unification see J. Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge 1959), *ad indicem*.

outline of Giovanni Aretino, “copista, notaio, cancelliere”⁴¹ — also, one might add, neurotic, apt to repine, eager for literary discussion and patronage. I turn now to an examination of notices, disparate in character and sometimes discordant, of one last friend of the scribe, “Langustus tuus”, whose letters Bruni expects with keen anticipation at the beginning of *ep.*IV.20. This is the sort of personage that the Italians like to call a *fantasma*, a figure who flits in and out of the borderlands of Quattrocento history and letters. Somewhere in the archives, perhaps of Padua, Venice or the Vatican, his life lies buried awaiting excavation. Most of what currently passes for his biography needs thorough revision⁴².

The first records of him, “Jacopo de Languschis da Venezia del fu Giovanni da Pavia”, appear in the Venetian *libri commemoriali*, showing him active as a notary in the service of the Republic from 1409 to 1420⁴³. In 1420, at a sale of the effects of the late Messer Pietro Corner (Procurator of St Mark’s, died 1407), Languschi bought a book “super Epistolis” for 3 lire⁴⁴. Sabbadini saw his hand in Vat. Ottob. lat. 1984, Cicero *De Finibus* and *Acad. Post.*, which Aurispa copied in turn with *χειρὶ ἱακώβου οὐνενετοῦ*, as a colophon dated Constantinople, 12 August 1422, informs us⁴⁵. The humanistic script of this manuscript, the two hands of which are hard to distinguish, would suggest a shared interest with Giovanni Aretino⁴⁶; but the identification, though

⁴¹ From Nicolaj Petronio’s title, as n. 2.

⁴² No further contact of the scribe with Languschi, or indeed anyone else save perhaps Niccolò Luna, is recorded after Bruni’s second letter. For what follows, the most substantial sources are A. Segarizzi, “Jacopo Languschi, rimatore veneziano del sec. XV”, *Atti della Imp. reale Accademia degli Agiati in Rovereto* ser. 3, X.1 (1904), 179-182, Luiso, *Studi*, p. 100 n. 87, N. Giannetto, *Bernardo Bembo* (Florence 1985), p. 94 n. 38. The usual picture of Languschi is now summed up in M. L. King’s profile, *Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Dominance* (Princeton 1986), pp. 386-387.

⁴³ Segarizzi, “Jacopo Languschi”, p. 179.

⁴⁴ “pro uno libro super Epistolis ser Jacobo de langusti L.iii”, quoted by S. Connell, “Books and Their Owners in Venice, 1345-1480”, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 35 (1972), 163-186 at p. 168, from ASV, Procuratori di S. Marco de Citra, B.96 Quadernus (11 July 1420). Three lire was about three-quarters of a ducat. Languschi was plainly not the *author* of the book, as King, *Venetian Humanism*, p. 387, suggests; it may have been e.g. a commentary on the St. Paul-Seneca correspondence, or Athanasius on the Pauline letters.

⁴⁵ R. Sabbadini, *Giorn. stor. lett. ital.* 100 (1932), 272-273.

⁴⁶ On Ottob. lat. 1984 see D. Fava in *Accademie e biblioteche d’Italia* 6 (1932-1933), p. 115 fig. 4; Ullman, *Origin and Development*, pp. 85-86, E. Casamassima, *Literulae latinae*, in S. Caroti, S. Zamponi, *Lo scrittoio di Bartolomeo Fonzio* (Milan 1974), p. xv and fig. 2.

commonly accepted, is from comparison with certain autographs of Languschi very unlikely (cp. figs. 1 and 2), and there is no firm evidence of his having been in the East⁴⁷. Facciolati has him teaching at Padua, for an annual salary of 80 florins, from 1423 onwards⁴⁸; but hardly for the whole period till 1431, as people repeat after Facciolati, since despite his gaining a doctorate in arts on 16 August of that year⁴⁹, he had been appointed a papal secretary at Rome on 30 September 1428, and would have had no leisure for teaching elsewhere⁵⁰. It was in that city and at about that time that Panormita made his acquaintance, taking against his fellow poet⁵¹. He was active in the early years of Eugenius IV⁵², and Nicholas V, “intuitu virtutum ac studiorum liberalium artium, quibus a iuventute te deditum fuisse accepimus”, confirmed him in the prestigious post of secretary⁵³. He is mentioned with honour as one of the

⁴⁷ See nn. 52 and 59 below.

⁴⁸ *Fasti Gymnasii Patavii* (Padua 1757), I, p. liii; I find nothing in Quirini's *Diatriba* on Languschi, despite Facciolati's reference to it for further information.

⁴⁹ *Acta graduum academicorum gymnasii patavini ab anno MCCCCVI ad annum MCCCCCL* ed. G. Zonta and G. Brotto, ed. 2 (Padua 1980), I, p. 235 no. 743, p. 265 no. 830.

⁵⁰ F. C. Uginet, *Le “liber officialium” de Martin V* (Rome 1975), p. 80. His curial career is traced by E. von Ottenthal, “Die Bullenregister Martin V and Eugen IV”, *Mittheilungen Inst. Öst. Gesch.*, Ergänzungsband I (1885), 475–476, and W. von Hofmann, *Forschungen zur Geschichte der kurialen Behörden* (Berlin 1914), 2, p. 111.

⁵¹ See below at n. 61. Panormita stayed in Rome from December 1427 until early 1429: R. Sabbadini, “La polemica fra Porcelio e il Panormita”, *Rendiconti Ist. Lombardo* ser. 2, 50 (1917), p. 499. Languschi at that time was on friendly terms with another poet, Porcellio, but the latter, who could barely restrain himself from addressing laudatory verse to the most distant acquaintances, passes him by. I do not know on what ground Luiso claimed that Languschi had been in Rome for some years before 1428, *Studi*, p. 100 n. 87.

⁵² The handwriting of some papal briefs signed by him (one of them a humanistic hand, but not close to the hand of Ottob. lat. 1984) is analysed by T. Frenz, “Das Eindringen humanistischer Schriftformen”, *Archiv für Diplomatik* 20 (1974), p. 439, with Taf. IV no. 3. For other documents signed by him as papal secretary see: Luiso, *Studi*, p. 100 n. 87 (1428 and 1432); L. Pesce in *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia* 28 (1974), p. 87 n. 5 (1429); G. Hofmann, *Epistolae pontificiae ad Concilium Florentinum spectantes*, I (Rome 1940), p. 22 (1431) and p. 27 (1432); *Schedario Baumgarten* ed. S. Pagano, IV (Vatican City 1986), p. 5 (three briefs, December 1431 – January 1432); J. A. Twemlow, *Calendar of Papal Letters*, VIII (London 1909), p. 278 (1432); R. Predelli, *I libri commemoriali della Repubblica di Venezia*, IV (Venice 1896), p. 173 no. 180 (1433), K. A. Fink in *Römische Quartalschrift* 43 (1935), p. 68 (four briefs of 1432–1433). These dates give an idea of Languschi's active employment in the Curia.

⁵³ The partial text of the letter of confirmation given by Luiso should be dated to September 30 of the first year of Nicholas' papacy, 1447, not of Eugenius', as Luiso, nor yet 1446, as Segarizzi, p. 180 and G. L. Marini, *Degli archiatri pontifici* (Rome 1784), I, p. 241 note b: see von Hofmann, *Kuriale Behörden* 2, p. 111.

ornaments of the old papal curia by Gianbattista di Poggio Bracciolini, but never by Poggio himself, who must have served alongside him for good stretches of the quarter of a century that they were colleagues in the secretariat⁵⁴. Just as Poggio in slack or difficult times was able to remain at his home in Terranuova, so Giacomo seems to have passed much of his later life in Padua, if records of sale, taxation and litigation are a safe guide⁵⁵. His position at the curia appears to have become by this time purely nominal, Flavio Biondo having taken over his duties in the despatch of papal letters⁵⁶.

For all his elevated place at the papal court, as well as certain literary accomplishments shortly to be examined, Languschi figures hardly at all in humanist correspondence. After Bruni's brief mention, he is recorded only by a correspondent of Ambrogio Traversari⁵⁷. *Ep.* XXIV.27 in Mehus' edition is a letter of Stefano Porcari, dated Rome, 1 January 1429, which informs Traversari of Languschi's recent nomination as papal secretary. The preceding letter is from Languschi himself. It thanks Traversari in the name of Niccolò Leonardi, a Venetian physician, for a letter sent to the pope in recommendation of "Domnus Eustachius", and concludes with salutations to "summo oratori Leonardo Aretino magnoque investigatori Nicolao Nicoli". Leonardi's son Eustachio duly became Bishop of Corfu in November 1428, though he was soon to die in office⁵⁸. An original missive in Italian to Cosimo de'

⁵⁴ Gianbattista's *Vita Cardinalis Capranicae* in E. Baluze, *Miscellanea* I (Lucca 1761), p. 343. But he is not listed in the roll call of curial luminaries given in Lapo da Castiglionchio's *Dialogus de curiae commodis*, c. 1437: *Prosatori latini del Quattrocento* a c. di E. Garin (Milan 1952), pp. 206-208.

⁵⁵ Documents from the period 1443 to 1450, Segarizzi 180. The litigation in this latter year was with Antonio Roselli, a close friend of Poggio according to Poggio's *ep.* II.10.16 (Harth); on him see P. Verrua in *Giornale Dantesco*, 29 (1926), 313-332.

⁵⁶ So von Ottenthal, "Die Bullenregister", p. 479; he was not among the papal secretaries present at Eugenius IV's funeral: G. Bourgin, *Arch. Soc. Rom. di Stor. Pat.*, 27 (1904), p. 218.

⁵⁷ Besides Poggio's silence, his other secretarial colleagues such as Andrea Fiocchi, Biondo, Cencio de' Rustici seem not to name him. I have looked also at the letters of Aurispa, Francesco Barbaro, Barzizza, Lapo da Castiglionchio, Filelfo, Guarino, Panormita, Pius II, George of Trebizond, Valla, Vergerio, without result.

⁵⁸ *A. Traversarii latinae epistolae* ed. L. Mehus (Florence 1759), col. 1005, Luise Studi, p. 100 n. 87. The letter is written from the Colonna fief of Genzano, 12 August, so is more likely to date from Martin V's reign ("1428?": Sabbadini, *Rend. Ist. Lomb.* 50 (1917), p. 500 n. 2) than from Eugenius' and 1432, as Luise proposed, *Riordinamento dell'epistolario di A.T.*, fasc. 3 (Florence 1903), p. 48. This letter is to be connected with those published by L. Bertalot, "Zwölf Briefe des Ambrogio Traversari", *Studien*, II, pp. 251-267, nos. 1-4, which confirm Sabbadini's dating. For Leonardi, see V. Zaccaria, "Niccolò

Medici, dated from Venice 17 September 1441, remains in the Florentine archives. Languschi asks him to help secure "la riformata dispensation matrimoniale per Martino Longo mio amico" and encloses a letter from Francesco Morosini to the same effect: presumably Cosimo was in a position to obtain such dispensations from the papal curia, then resident in Florence with Eugenius IV⁵⁹. The sparkling letters after which Bruni hungered have not otherwise been preserved, to all appearances, but evidence of a rather surprising range of literary endeavour can be gleaned from contemporaries and from isolated remnants attached to his name.

Two Petrarchan sonnets in volgare were the occasion of Segarizzi's presentation of the "rimatore veneziano"⁶⁰. He must have written Latin verses too, for his sonorous and bombastic compositions attracted the derision of Panormita⁶¹. And indeed Languschi versified Cicero's account of the figures of speech, an educational work that presumably dates from the time of his teaching at Padua⁶². Two speeches to Martin V doubtless date from the period 1428-1431, and a third, found alongside them in Vienna N.B., lat. 3420 ff.126-128, celebrates a marriage, probably at Ferrara⁶³. Languschi apparently turned his hand to comedy as well; Tito Livio Frulovisi rejects with some heat the notion circulated by enemies that his *Corollaria*, staged at Venice c. 1432,

Leonardi, i suoi corrispondenti e una lettera inedita di Pier Paolo Vergerio", *Atti e mem. dell'Accad. Patavina*, 95, parte 3 (cl. di scienze morali, lettere ed arti), 1982-1983, 95-116, C. Griggio, "Il codice berlinese lat. fol. 667: nuove lettere di Francesco Barbaro", *Miscellanea di studi in onore di V. Branca*, III.1 (Florence 1983), p. 159 n. 1, and M. L. King, *Venetian Humanism*, pp. 387-389.

⁵⁹ ASF, MAP XI.471, cf. *Archivio Mediceo avanti il Principato: Inventario I* (Rome 1951), p. 213. Languschi's untidy handwriting here is quite distinct from the hand of Ottob. lat. 1984 claimed to be his by Sabbadini: see above nn. 45 and 46, and compare figs. 1 and 2 (pp. 28-29).

⁶⁰ "Jacopo Languschi", pp. 181-182; they are mentioned also by Luiso *loc. cit.* (from MSS Riccard. 1154 ff. 129^v-130 and Vicenza B.C. 128 f. 39^v-40).

⁶¹ Sabbadini (as n. 51) prints from Panormita's 1432 attack on Porcellio criticism of Languschi's "lectissima quaedam / verba sonora". That they are Latin appears from the possibility that Porcellio thought them Greek, in Panormita's contemptuous view.

⁶² C. Santoro, *I codici medioevali della B. Trivulziana* (Milan 1965), pp. 184-185: "Compendium elocutionis lectum ex Cicerone metrice editum per Jacobum Langustum Venetum", cod. 761 ff. 85-90^v. My attention was drawn to this work by G. C. Alessio, *Bene Florentini Candelabrum* (Padua 1983), p. lxxix n. 2. It is a hexameter précis of *Ad Herennium* 4.17 — end, with a prose preface in which Languschi explains the advantages of brevity and metricality for the memorising of "Cicero's" figures. Bruni's *Fabula Tancredi* by the same hand (not Languschi's), f. 31ff., is dated 1436.

⁶³ These I have not seen: see Segarizzi, pp. 180-181, Luiso, *loc. cit.*

plagiarised a play by one Languscius. If that play was anything like Frulovisi's, it was a mêlée of Plautine themes very inexpertly stitched together, "little better than a series of scenes, filled with untimely explanations of the plot", and "assai disordinata"⁶⁴.

Perhaps our author was a historian of sorts. At least, he is credited with an account of the fall of Constantinople (May 1453) which Zorzi Dolfin patched into his chronicle of Venice⁶⁵. What has attracted the attention of students of the fall of Byzantium is a short but vividly drawn portrait of the personality of Mehmed II "the conqueror", expressly attributed by Dolfin to Languschi: "come describe D. Jacomo Langusto Veneto", Thomas p. 5. It is far from clear where the quotation of his views finishes, in what is basically a reworking of Leonardo of Chios' account of the conquest. My own feeling is that if Languschi is responsible for any of this, it is for the *description* of Mehmed alone, and not for the succeeding *narrative* of his actions, which, like other passages in Dolfin, will depend on an unknown source before Leonardo is again utilised (from Thomas p. 8ff.)⁶⁶. Nor is there any consensus on the date of the description, for which every year between 1452 and 1456 has been canvassed. There is furthermore a close relation between the "eye-witness" description of Languschi and the report that Niccolò Sagundino made to Alfonso V on his return from Constantinople in December

⁶⁴ C. W. Previtè-Orton, *Opera hactenus inedita T. Livii de Frulovisiis* (Cambridge 1932), p. xxiv, A. Stäuble, "Le sette commedie dell'umanista T.L.F.", *Rinascimento* 3 (1963), p. 27. In the prologues of *Claudi duo* and *Oratoria*, "hunc [Frulovisi] accusant Langusci dedisse fabulam, non suam"; "non qui suam sed Langusci dederit fabulam", Previtè-Orton, p. 35 and p. 153, passages quoted also by Stäuble, *La commedia umanistica del Quattrocento* (Florence 1968), p. 65. It is perhaps worth pointing out that Frulovisi was probably a student at Padua when Languschi was teaching there in the 1420s: Sabbadini, "Tito Livio Frulovisio", *Giorn. stor. lett. ital.* 103 (1934), p. 57.

⁶⁵ "The chronicle of the Venetian Giacomo Languschi ...", as E. W. Bodnar, *Cyriacus of Ancona and Athens* (Brussels 1961), p. 66, puts it. A. Pertusi in many publications even gives this chronicle a title, "Excidio et presa di Costantinopoli", for which I can find no authority (e.g. "La lettera di Filippo da Rimini", *Μνημόσυνον Σοφίας Αντωνιάδης* (Venice 1974), pp. 120-157 at p. 134 n. 58, and *Lauro Quirini umanista*, ed. V. Branca (Florence 1977), p. 189, where he prints part of the work in question, as does Bodnar). The full text is in G. M. Thomas, "Die Eroberung Constantinopels im Jahre 1453 aus einer venetianischen Chronik", *SB bayer. Akad.* II.1 (1868), 1-41 at pp. 5-6.

⁶⁶ Pertusi, *La caduta di Costantinopoli. Le testimonianze dei contemporanei* I (Florence 1976), pp. 121-122 speaks of *Languschi's* translation of Leonardo, but this is by Dolfin's admission his own. J. R. Melville Jones, *The Siege of Constantinople 1453: Seven Contemporary Accounts* (Amsterdam 1972), pp. 125-130, gives as Languschi's all the matter on pp. 126-128, translating Thomas p. 5 *El signor Maumetho* - p. 8 *a lui vicino*.

1453, which makes it at least doubtful that the former offers independent witness⁶⁷.

A neglected piece of evidence, found far from Constantinople, places a heavy burden on those who would have Languschi writing an account of its capture by the Turks. The last archival record of him is a grant by the pope of some Paduan lands in emphyteusis, 16 December 1452⁶⁸. In 1453, according to an autograph note on the guard leaf of Eton College MS 137, Bernardo Bembo bought this "Vetruvius" from the library of "Jacobi Languschi Veneti Post eius casum patauui: sub astatione ..." ⁶⁹. Bernardo was keen on dates, which he applied liberally to passages of his life recorded in his notebooks and manuscript margins. This one was admittedly written at a distance of forty years from the acquisition, after he had recovered the manuscript alienated some twenty years before, but its precision must rest on more than memory and we shall see that there is no good reason to doubt the accuracy of this sole indication of Languschi's death.

In that case we cannot have him voyaging to the east in 1456⁷⁰, nor giving prophetic discourse in 1467 in a *Triologus in rebus futuris XX annorum proximorum*. The evidence of this strange work has been misapplied. It is not Candiano Bollani's, as Segarizzi was the first, but by no means the last, to say⁷¹, nor is its dramatic date to be placed "about 1465" or "nel 1467"⁷². The dialogue (or "trialogue")⁷³ repre-

⁶⁷ The whole affair is very complex. I refer to J. Raby, "Cyriacus of Ancona and the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 43 (1980), 242-246 for a good resumé of the problems and preceding bibliography, and for the important point that Languschi does *not* have Ciriaco in the Sultan's camp in 1452/3.

⁶⁸ Reg. Vat. 424 f. 39^v: see von Hofmann, *Kuriale Behörden* 2, p. 111, and for the precise date, Marini, *Degli archiatri pontifici* II, p. 136. He had been involved in litigation at Padua in March 1450 (Segarizzi, p. 180 n. 4).

⁶⁹ N. Giannetto (as n. 42), p. 302, N. R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, II (Oxford 1977), p. 758. I have seen a microfilm of this MS in the Bodleian Library. A plate showing the inscription is in Giannetto, "Un'orazione inedita di Bernardo Bembo", *Atti Ist. Ven.* 140 (1981-82), pp. 257-288, tav. II.

⁷⁰ Frenz (as n. 52), p. 439 n. 111, who misunderstands F. Babinger, *Mehmed der Eroberer und seine Zeit* (Munich 1953), p. 115. Babinger anyway retracted all that he had said on Languschi in that book in "Johannes Darius (1414-1494)", *SB bayer. Akad., Phil.-hist. Kl.*, 5 (1961), 15 n. 2.

⁷¹ "Jacopo Languschi", p. 181. G. Pillinini in *DBI* XI, p. 287B, s.v. Bollani, Candiano, says (rightly) "di ignoto autore".

⁷² Raby, "Cyriacus", p. 244, Pillinini, *loc. cit.*

⁷³ Venice, Marc. lat. XIV 245 (4682) ff. 2-9^v, on which see P. Zorzanello, *Catalogo dei codici latini della B.N. Marciana di Venezia*, III (Trezzano 1985), pp. 414-419; this composite MS is partly in the hand of Marin Sanudo, but not the *Triologus*, in a good humanistic cursive found only here in the MS.

sents *Domenicus Episcopus, Languscius philosophus et Candianus Bollanus orator* as engaged in an involved discussion in which cosmology, astrological prognostication and apocalyptic eschatology are brought to bear on the question of what the future holds — nothing very good, for “sumus in fine seculorum”, f.7. Languschi is made to say that he had *already* dedicated to Andrea Morosini a work on celestial conjunctions from the time of the Flood to 1465⁷⁴, together with a detailed concordance of the moving and fixed heads of Aries⁷⁵. The conjunction of the “two superior bodies” of Jupiter and Saturn will take place in Scorpio in the years 1484 to 1504, heralding the end of the world and the Second Coming. These are the “next twenty years” of the title⁷⁶, and specific predictions are made concerning the unfolding of events: Byzantium, for example, will be retaken by the Christians about 1492. I judge, therefore, that the *Trialogus* is a work of the early 1480s, and a product of that decade’s fervid atmosphere, which Garin has characterised as “satura di profetismo ermetico, di annunci escatologici *de everione* o *de adventu Antichristi*”⁷⁷. The *Trialogus* may in fact date from late 1484 if the statement on f.9^v, “nunc pontificatum novum habemus”, is narrowly interpreted, for Innocent VIII was elected on 29 August. The “heavy conjunction” of the planets on 25 November of the same year aroused particularly active apocalyptic speculation. A closely comparable and very influential work, perhaps indeed the inspiration for the *Trialogus*, was published in 1484 by a Dutch astrologer resident in Padua, Paul of Middelburg, who delivered therein prognostications precisely for the twenty years with which our work deals⁷⁸.

⁷⁴ “nominique suo [sc. Maurocenij] dedicavi iudicium distinctum per divisionem temporum in coniunctionibus maximis magnis mediis et minoribus, a tempore dilluvii usque ad annum gratie 1465”, f. 7^v.

⁷⁵ “simul cum concordantia capitis arietis mobilis cum capite fixi arietis none spere, contra intentionem opusculi Iohannis de Lubech”, f. 8. John of Lübeck’s astrological prediction of the coming of Antichrist was composed at Padua in 1474, and printed in the same year: L. Thorndike, “Three Astrological Predictions”, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 26 (1963), 343-347 at p. 345. It is not clear whether the work for Morosini is separate from the concordance of Aries; and if it is, why the former stopped in 1465.

⁷⁶ “coniunctionem duorum superiorum in Scorpione ... anno gratie 1484 duraturam usque ad annos 1504 vel iuxta tempora istorum viginti annorum, de quibus annis nunc apertum habebis pronosticum”, f. 8.

⁷⁷ Actually with reference to the 1480s and 90s: E. Garin, *Lo zodiaco della vita* (Rome 1976), p. 86, with examples.

⁷⁸ *Magistri Pauli de Middelburgo Prenostica ad viginti annos duratura* (Antwerp 1484), discussed by A. Warburg, “Heidnisch-antike Weissagung in Wort und Bild zu Luthers Zeiten” (1920) in his *Gesammelte Schriften*, II (Leipzig 1932), pp. 514-515. See further on

By that time not only Candiano Bollani, but all three participants were dead⁷⁹. Apart from the other reasons for thinking Languschi dead in the 1450s, in 1484 he would have been nearly 100 years old if he had been a notary of the Venetian republic already in 1409 (p. 12 above), a position hardly to be held by someone under twenty.

On f.8 of the *Trialogus* Bollani enquires where Languschi's earlier *iudicium* may be found, and he is told that one Rīgus had been given the book and will lend a copy. The dialogue ends with a request from Domenichi that Languschi expand on his doom-laden prophecies concerning the popes. For further information he is simply referred again to Rīgus, who has made a *Vasylographus* in which all is revealed⁸⁰. Who may this man be, apparently the only source of "Languschi's" writings? I believe that he is the true author of the Venice *Trialogus*, and furthermore that the figure of Languschi shown there is no more than the author's persona, who holds views we should no longer attribute to the sober and level-headed (and dead) papal secretary. A passage which guides us to this conclusion is found on f.8^v, where Languschi's mastery in prophecy is attributed to "Lulius", i.e. Ramón Llull⁸¹.

There is another fifteenth-century Venetian *Trialogus*, now resident in Glasgow University Library, which forms part of a work that avowedly

the 1484 constellation Garin, *Lo zodiaco*, pp. 143-144 n. 24, D. Kurze, "Prophecy and History", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 21 (1958), 63-85, M. Lentzen, *Studien zur Dante-Exegese Cristoforo Landino* (Vienna 1971), p. 173, C. Vasoli, *Profezia e ragione* (Naples 1974), pp. 453-454.

⁷⁹ Bollani died of plague in August 1478 (Pillinini, *DBI* XI p. 287, and cf. M. King's profile, *Venetian Humanism*, pp. 340-341). *Domenicus Episcopus*, called *Episcopus Brixien-sis* on f. 2^v, is Domenico de' Domenichi, Bishop of Brescia, who died in his episcopal city on 17 February 1478: H. Jedin, *Studien über Domenico de' Domenichi* (Wiesbaden 1958), p. 214. For the astrological/philosophical interests of these two, note Bollani's *De signis coelestibus* (F. Sansovino, *Venetia citta nobilissima* (Venice 1604), f. 387^v), and Domenichi's *Quaestio de nominibus his: quidditas et essentia* (Vat. lat. 6234 f. 99), which was dedicated to Bollani in 1471 when he was governor of Brescia: see Jedin, pp. 201, 282. Simon de Phares, a French astrologer in the time of Charles VIII, called Domenichi "souverain astrologien" who published annual prognostications (*Recueil des plus célèbres astrologues et quelques hommes doctes*, ed. E. Wickersheimer (Paris 1929), p. 262; and cf. Domenichi's lost *Practica astrologiae* mentioned by Jedin, pp. 221-222).

⁸⁰ "Ep. Quid ultra de pontificibus? Lang. Rīgus vasylographum fecit. Ibi deposita sunt omnia", the closing words, f. 9^v. *Vasylographus* = royal writing (Gk. βασιλικός = L. *regius* = Rīgus); Sibylline prophecies circulated widely in the later Middle Ages in a book of this title: see C. H. Haskins, *Studies in Medieval Science*, ed. 2 (Cambridge, Mass. 1927), p. 173ff.

⁸¹ "Defunctus est qui me dominum fecit, servum me fecit patria. [...] Et si Lulius viget, quid mihi patria boni? Debeo uni et non alteri".

seeks to condense the teaching of forty books of Llull into ten books⁸². This *Trialogus* is the sixth of the *Decem libri* which occupy most of the manuscript; the whole work was dedicated to Franciscus Bollanus, son of Candiano, by Ludovicus Rīgus in 1485, *anno primo motus ecclesiae*⁸³. The dialogue, concluded like its counterpart in Venice by the word *τελωσ*, takes place between Ludovicus (Rīgus himself, I suppose) and two brothers, Franciscus and Mapheus, who address Ludovicus as *pater*, though not necessarily because they are his sons. The conversation seeks to enlighten the obscurities of the Lullian *Arbor*⁸⁴, without success for one present-day reader. The dense and frequently opaque Latin of the Glasgow *Trialogus* recalls that of its namesake in Venice, and I am convinced that they are the work of the same author. To prove this would take us too far afield in an already rambling discussion, but as a sample I give a confrontation between lines of Languscius and Ludovicus from the first page of their respective *Trialogi*:

Languscius An in linea recta, vel (ut aiunt) in Syrpo [*sic*] nodum queris?
(Marc. lat. XIV 245,f.2)

Ludovicus Non licet ante tempus nodum in Syrpo [*sic*] querere.
(Glasgow University Library, Ferguson 13, f.159)

Ludovicus moreover on f.160 speaks of reaching understanding *per lineam rectam*. I suggest, then, that the leading figure in both dialogues represents the author, and that the apocalyptic vision and bibliography⁸⁵ given to *Languscius* in the Venice piece should be taken as Rīgus' own. Bembo on the Eton flyleaf qualifies Languschi as "clarissimus mathematicus", but this may reflect no more than an inferred interest of Languschi in the mathematical, cosmological and mechanical portions of

⁸² GUL, Ferguson 13, fully described by Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts*, II, pp. 880-882.

⁸³ f. 286^v. This phrase recalls the beginning of the world collapse predicted for the *novum pontificatum* (of Innocent VIII, if that is right: p. 18 above) in the Venice *Trialogus*.

⁸⁴ *Arbor philosophiae amoris*, written at Paris 1298, printed at Mainz, *Lullii opera omnia*, vol. VI, in 1737.

⁸⁵ Including the "quodam libello aphorismorum scientie huius ... de religione Christiana purificanda" mentioned by Bollani to Languschi on f. 7; the first two books of the Glasgow *Decem libri* are made up of *centum Aphorismorum* of an alchemical character, also found in BN Florence, Magl. XVI.67. The aphorisms of Rīgus in Oxford, Bodleian, Canon. Misc. 109, ff. 87^v-95^v, seem to be something different: "Ex aphorismis Ludovici de Rhegiis. Inc. Dominus horae in omnibus formis". G. Beaujouan mentions a work of Ludovicus Rīgus *De iudiciis astronomicis* in Seville, Colombina 5-6-22: "Manuscrits scientifiques médiévaux de la B. Colombine", *Actes du 10^e Congrès International d'Histoire des Sciences* (Paris 1964), p. 633.

Vitruvius, rather than a passion for the sort of astrological speculation found in the *Triologus*⁸⁶.

Rigius presents problems of his own, but *ne nodum in scirpo quaerere videar*, I shall leave them aside⁸⁷. His connexion with Languschi, however, is not quite exhausted. In some way he acquired that same codex of Vitruvius, Eton 137, which Bernardo Bembo says he bought from Languschi's estate on the latter's death. The long flyleaf note by Bembo, dated 16 June 1493, states that he had on that day recovered it after an absence of "xx ferme annos" from "Paulus Cornelius Ludovici filius: quem de Arrigis dictitant". The twenty or so years that Vitruvius lodged with Rigius have left an "owner's" mark on f.ii: "Ludovici Rigii Cornarii", to which Bembo drily added, "Obiit dignus vir. x^o Octobris 1492"⁸⁸. Even supposing that Bembo misdated Languschi's death, we have here firm evidence that he was at least dead when Rigius came into possession of the MS about 1473, when it had already undergone "multiplici amicorum usu". But I believe from another line of enquiry that Bembo was right, or at least not provably wrong, in assigning Languschi's death at Padua to the year 1453.

Francesco Contarini's untitled *Dialogus* has three Venetian poetasters eternally condemned to drift aimlessly on the Styx: Matteo Ronto (d. 1442), Antonio Baratella (d. 1448), and our Languschi. Why must these unfortunates exceed even "Ulixis errores"? "quia dum vita manebat et versu et soluta oratione semper erravimus"⁸⁹. Segarizzi

⁸⁶ Vitruvius Books IX and X. Giannetto, *Bernardo Bembo*, p. 94 n. 38 connects Bembo's statement with Languschi's presumed astrological interests. Bernardo was only 19 or 20 when he bought the manuscript, and may not have known Languschi personally.

⁸⁷ He is to be distinguished from the homonyms Ludovicus Regius Corneliensis, editor of Cicero's letters, Ludovico degli Arrighi of Vicenza, the scribe, Ludovicus Regius of Imola (J. J. G. Alexander and A. C. de la Mare, *The Italian Manuscripts in the Library of J. R. Abbey*, London 1969, p. xxx n. 5) and Ludovicus Regius, s. XVI = Louis Leroy. His own name appears as Ludovicus Cornelius de Arrighis, L. de Rhegiis, L. Rigius Cornarius, Lodovico degli Arrighi Corner, and plain L. Rigius.

⁸⁸ The Glasgow manuscript, which contains further alchemical works beyond the *Decem libri*, was subscribed by another hand "die 6 octobris 1492 ... ex ordine auctoris" (Ker, *Medieval manuscripts* II, p. 881), presumably when Rigius was on his deathbed.

⁸⁹ A. Segarizzi, "Francesco Contarini", *Nuovo Arch. Veneto* 12.1 (1906), pp. 272-306 at p. 301; see also p. 283 on this passage. On Baratella, a prolific but unpraised poet, see Segarizzi, "Antonio Baratella e i suoi corrispondenti", *Misc. stor. veneta*, ser. 3, 10 (1916); in particular, p. 112 on Languschi, where a poem addressed to him in Baratella's collection *Laureia* (c. 1430) is mentioned. On Ronto, *Enciclopedia Dantesca* IV (Rome 1973), col. 1037-1038, and M. Tagliabue, "Per la biografia di Matteo Ronto", *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 26 (1983), 151-188, with ample preceding bibliography. A letter to Guarino recently printed with a translation by I. Opelt (without knowing that it is *ep.* 590

(p. 284) suggested that the piece was written c. 1450, but it must be somewhat later if Languschi is portrayed there as already dead; there would be no point in coupling two dead (cf. *dum vita manebat*) poets with a living one⁹⁰. And if, as seems likely, Contarini died about 1460⁹¹, the dead poet in his dialogue cannot himself have expired later than that date. I therefore find no difficulty in accepting Bembo's date, but many in supposing that Languschi travelled even once to the Orient, let alone that he wrote an account of the taking of Constantinople.

We have travelled far in search of Languschi, though he has not gained much flesh along the way, from the Golden Horn to Glasgow, via Venice, the Vatican and Eton College; from plots of land in Padua to the waters of the underworld and the fires of the Apocalypse. On that very final note we leave the phantom friend of the enigmatic scribe who occasions these pages⁹².

M. C. Davies
King's College, Cambridge

APPENDIX 1

A LETTER OF GIOVANNI ARETINO TO GIULIANO DE' MEDICI

Iuliano de Medicis Ioannes Arretinus pl. s. d.

Pauperiorem ego me nunquam inveni quam nunc cum ad te scribere velle incepti. Etenim cum ingenii mei ariditatem contemplor, puerile quiddam tota vita totoque labore a me confectum intueor ut nequeam

Sabb.), *Deutsches Dante Jahrbuch* 60 (1985), 117-134, shows that Ronto had the gravest difficulty in framing a comprehensible Latin sentence.

⁹⁰ In addition, the voyagers through the underworld come across Ciriaco of Ancona (Segarizzi, "Contarini", p. 292: "quendam Anconitanum notum nempe hominem" who is cleaning a stone "ut epigramate insigni lucupletatus sua quadam inflatus gloriola in Italiam reverti posset"); difficulties in the way of accepting that Ciriaco died in 1452, "the one recorded date for his death", have been removed by Raby, "Ciriaco of Ancona" (see especially p. 245).

⁹¹ Segarizzi, "Contarini", p. 277, asserted only that his subject was no longer alive in 1476, when his wife was termed a widow; but as Margaret King in discussing his death points out (following Pertusi): "Contarini's active political, academic and literary careers, which left many traces before then [1460], all cease by that date". (*Venetian Humanism*, p. 350, a profile of Contarini).

⁹² I am very grateful for attentive reading of earlier versions of this article, and helpful suggestions thereon, to Dr R. Black, Dr A. C. de la Mare and Prof. M. D. Reeve.

prorsus homini suadere quae recta sint. Est autem id quidem puerile valde ruditatem in arte servare nec secundum illam quae velis adimplere posse. Quid autem nunc est quod nequeam? Tibi profecto aliquid suadere volui, idque me consecuturum esse diffido.

Affui nuper quorundam sermonibus qui de optimis humanitatis studiis verba fecere. Eorum vero sermonum omnis intentio circa praeclara rhetorices ac philosophiae studia exquisitamque illam praestantiam versabantur [*sic*], quam quidem omnibus saeculis paucissimos, nostris vero temporibus nullos assequutos putavere. Idemque cum aliquos his rebus magis idoneos scrutarentur et per Florentinorum praeclaras familias vagarentur, in tuam inciderunt, paucisque de tua familia adolescentibus memoratis in te velut in quod magis¹ splenderet lumen versi sunt. Mirati sunt cum praeclarissimas ingenii tui dotes volverent aptitudinemque ipsam illam tuam, cui omnia suppetunt quae ad perficiendum hominem expetuntur, tibi praestitam exploratissimum haberent. In hoc aiebant bona corporis ingeniique dotes universae insunt. Quid autem a fortuna expetendum tibi esset prorsus ignorare se fassi sunt.

A me autem requirebant quaenam ratio vitae studiorumque tuorum esset, ut si scirem depromerem. Omnes eos quos hiis dotibus carere constitisset summopere illas optare atque ab immortali deo expetere; eum vero cui concessae fuissent, ad summam non anniti obstupescebant. O singularem atque admirabilem felicitatem tuam, si illa ipsa in te recognoscis, quae illi solertissime coniectantur. Tune tuimet ipsius ignarus eris? Agnosce tandem qualis creatus sis qualisque vivas. Nam pauca tibi desunt ad illa peragenda per quae divinitatem in homine summamque praestantiam comparat Quintilianus. Tibi ingenium, tibi vox, tibi gestus, omnesque animi motus suavissimi, ut illi aiunt atque ut mihi videtur, insunt atque omnia quae hominum gloriam ac favorem pariunt abundantissime suppetunt. Caetera omnia apud te esse tute ipse non ignoras.

Compone igitur et ex aliis recognosce tuae orationis capillos splendoremque illum aureum eloquentiae doctrinae lumine exsuscita ac divinitatem illam in te dormientem ut reviviscat elabora. Praeclare ille qui sine doctrina mortis imaginem vitam appellavit. Plurimi sunt qui cum in te tantam aptitudinem intueantur quantam in nullo reliquo, ad haec te adhortari idque tibi suaderi gliscunt. Hunc mihi laborem quidam cum iniunxissent errare mihi visi sunt qui homini parum in litteris

¹ maius *m.a. in marg.*

erudito tam magna onera imposuerint. Plurima sunt in te praeclara et admiranda, immo certe omnia. Etenim fortunae et corporis animique tui bona tanta sunt ut nequaquam satis illa pro meritis unquam laudaturus sim, qui me et meas vires satis novi. Invalidus sum profecto tantae rei ponderi subeundo. Sed illud certum est: si quam amplissima dixerō, tunc tibi satisfacturum esse me et fieri posse ut tibi ea ratione satisfiat. Colitur hic una <v>irtute praeditus; ille altera carissimus est multis, alius vero mediocribus quibusdam adamatur. Tu omnis facillime assequi potes ac Deo proximus fieri.

Tanta est in cunctis spes tui, mi Iuliane, atque amor ut cum te amplissimis rebus supra omnes idoneum existimarunt, ea in te perfici concupiscant quae et in se et in nullis expectanda esse aut perfici posse sperent; ac veluti si rex quispiam creandus esset, is potissimum cunctis suffragiis crearetur qui hiis dotibus ornamentisque insignitus esset quae in rege maxime expetuntur, animus in illum regius et praestantissimae corporis dotes facile cernerentur, ille vero sui similes adoptaret et consensu omnium ad societatem ac successionem regni demum servaret aleretque, t<e quidem>² veluti regio illo ornatum animo cuncti ad r.p. gubernacula perfectissimum optantes arcessunt. Cui rei ut annitare teque talem qualem cupiunt efficere conari oportet maximus ut fias: suaderi id tibi plurimi volunt quibus ipsa magis causa quam mea oratio satis factura videtur; maximeque illa quae in animis bene institutis plurimum dominatur in te suas summas exercebit vires. Egoque sic videbor, etsi minime idoneus fuerim, in te adhortando grande aliquid, ne dicam maximum, profecisse. Inter hos Jannoçius optimo ingenio adolescens et item Pierus Pieri illius aequalis suavis quippe ac iocundus sodales fuere. Quorum ego te nominibus saluto et meo quoque salvum esse iubeo. Nimum forsani dixi, nedum plura mihi dicenda sint. Averardo me plurimum commendato atque etiam Cosme Laurentio Niccole reliquisque cum aderis. Tu vale teque ut perficias diligenter curato. Florentiae Idib. Jan. 1417.

A tergo Praeclarae indolis atque optimae spei adolescenti Iuliano Averardi fi. de Medicis Venetiis.

Archivio di Stato, Firenze: MAP LXXXIX.287.

² Supplevi ad lac.

APPENDIX 2

MANUSCRIPTS BY GIOVANNI ARETINO

This list brings together all manuscripts certainly or very probably by Giovanni, in roughly chronological order, with brief bibliography. I am greatly indebted to Dr de la Mare for some unpublished attributions (see nos. 22-25, undated, but presumably from Giovanni's period in Florence, and no. 30, presumably from his Venetian period). A few manuscripts which have been attributed to him in print are rejected in a separate list at the end.

1. *St. Gallen, Stadtbibl.* 298: Eusebius/Jerome. Perhaps Giovanni in 1410 or earlier. Annotations by Tanaglia. De la Mare, "Humanistic script: the first ten years" 105 and figs. 8 and 9.
2. *Escorial N.III.7: Gorgias* tr. Leonardo Bruni. Fols 2-8v by Giovanni, the rest by Niccoli; dedication copy c. 1410 with headings by Poggio. De la Mare, "Humanistic script" 102 and fig. 7a.
3. *Florence, Laur.* 83.6: Cic. *Nat. deor, Div., Fat.* Probably for Bernardo Portinari c. 1410. De la Mare, "Humanistic script" 103 and fig. 7b.
4. *Vat. Pal. lat.* 1496: Cic. *Fam.* Finished in Florence for Nicolaus Ricius, 5 June 1410. Ullman, *Origin* 91f. and fig. 45, Regoliosi, "Nuove ricerche II" tav. XIII.2, de la Mare, "Humanistic script" 102. Later belonged to Giannozzo Manetti: G.M. Cagni, "I codici Vaticani Palatino-latini appartenuti alla biblioteca di G. Manetti", *La Bibliofilia* 62 (1960) 27 no. 61.
5. *Florence, Laur.* 63.4: Livy 1st Decade. Perhaps made for Nicolaus Ricius, c. 1412 (not for Cosimo de' Medici, a later owner). De la Mare, "Florentine MSS of Livy in the fifteenth century", *Livy*, ed. T. A. Dorey, London 1971, 180-181, "Humanistic script" 102 n. 52, Ullman, *Origin* 92-93.
6. *Laur.* 63.5: Livy 3rd Decade. Uniform with above, dated 28 April 1412. De la Mare, "Florentine MSS" pl. II.
7. *Laur.* 63.6: Livy 4th Decade. Uniform with 5 and 6, dated 13 Jan. 1413 ("Idibus Januariis ... MCCCCXII" in Florentine style).
8. *Vat. lat.* 9491: *Phaedo* trans. L. Bruni. Signed and dated November 1414 by "me Ioannem florentinum origine, qui Arretinus dicor". Baron, *Bruni Schriften* 229, Kristeller, *Iter Italicum* II.347.
9. *Munich, Staatsbibl. lat.* 763: Cic. *Tusc., Fin., Acad.* Finished at Florence, 10 Aug. 1414. Ullman, *Origin* 93 no. 3 and fig. 46.
10. *Florence, Laur.* 50.33: Cicero, *De orat.* Unsigned but datable to c. 1410-15 according to Dr de la Mare; attributed to Giovanni by M.D. Reeve, *Riv. Filol. Istruz. Class.* 112 (1984) 269 n. 1.
11. *Florence, Laur.* 48.10: Cicero, 28 orations. Made for Cosimo, 13 Feb. 1416. Ullman, *Origin* 93-94 no. 5, A. Hessel, *Arch. f. Urkundenforschung* 13 (1935) pl. 2a, Rizzo, *Catalogo dei codici della Pro Cluentio ciceroniana*, Genoa 1983, 40-41.
12. *Florence, Laur.* 48.11: Cicero, 24 orations. Headings and end, f.235-236v, attributed to Giovanni (c. 1416) by de la Mare: Rizzo, *Catalogo* 41-42. The rest of the MS was written by Poggio, with rubrication by Niccoli.
13. *Florence, Laur.* 78.24: Francesco Barbaro *De re uxoria*. Finished 24 May

1416. Copied from the dedication copy, Laur. 78.25: C. Griggio in *Rinascimento* 26 (1986) 43 n. 23. Ullman, *Origin* 94 no. 6 and fig. 48, Hessel pl. 2b.
14. *Florence, Laur. 66.12*: Justin. Finished for Cosimo 15 May 1417. Ullman, *Origin* 94 no. 7 and fig. 49.
 15. *Florence, Laur. 46.13*: Quintilian. Unsigned, c. 1417-18. De la Mare, *Handwriting* 49 n. 2.
 16. *Florence, Laur. 64.4*: Suetonius. Unsigned but datable to c. March 1418. Attributed to Giovanni by de la Mare: V. Brown, *Viator* 12 (1981) 334 n. 52 item 4; see also F. Ames-Lewis, *The library of Piero di Cosimo de' Medici*, London 1984, 287. A plate of a miniature and a few words of writing in Tav. 61 of A. Garzelli, *Miniatura fiorentina*.
 17. *Oxford, Bodleian, D'Orville 78*: Cicero, 8 speeches. Unsigned, c. 1418. Attributed to Giovanni by Hunt, "Humanistic script in Florence", *Calligraphy and palaeography* ed. A. S. Osley, London 1965, 273 and fig. 47b. De la Mare, *Handwriting* 49 n. 2, M. C. Davies, "A note on the history of MS D'Orville 78", *Bodleian Library Record*, XI.4 (1984) 253-258.
 18. *Florence, B.N., Conv. Soppr. I.IX.35*: Iuvenus, Proba. Made for Cosimo at Florence 13 Feb., probably after 1418. Ullman, *Origin* 94 no. 8 and fig. 50.
 19. *Florence, B.N., Conv. Soppr. I.VII.18*: Chrysostom, *Adv. vituperatores*. Made for Cosimo at Florence 5 Feb., probably after 1418. Ullman, *Origin* 94 no. 10.
 20. *Florence, Laur. 79.7*: Aristotle, *Ethics* tr. L. Bruni. Made for Cosimo, probably after 1418. Ullman, *Origin* 94 no. 11.
 21. *Florence, Riccard. 500*: Cicero *Att.* Undated, signed "Ioannes Arretinus". Ullman, *Origin* 95 no. 12.
 22. *Florence, Laur. 54.18*: Demosthenes and Aeschines, speeches translated by Bruni. Ex-libris of Cosimo. Undated and unsigned; attributed to Giovanni by Dr de la Mare.
 23. *Florence, Laur. 68.13*: Caesar. Ex-libris of Piero de' Medici, presumably from Cosimo. Undated and unsigned; attributed to Giovanni by Dr de la Mare.
 24. *Florence, Laur. 82.8*: Plato, *Gorgias* and *Phaedo*, tr. L. Bruni. Giovanni wrote the first part, according to Dr de la Mare; the MS was later completed for Piero de' Medici.
 25. *Vat. Pal. lat. 1486*: Cicero, speeches. Giovanni copied the text from f.91 to the end, and all the headings. Belonged to Manetti. Attributed to Giovanni by Dr de la Mare.
 26. *Florence, Laur. 79.11*: Aristotle, *Ethics* tr. L. Bruni. Copied at Venice 30 August, presumably 1421-23. Ullman, *Origin* 95 no. 13, Regoliosi, "Nuove ricerche II" 133.
 27. *Vat. lat. 3237*: Cicero, *De Or., Orat., Brutus*. Dated 25 Dec. 1422, Venice. Attributed to Giovanni by Regoliosi, "Nuove ricerche II" 132-133 and tav. XII.2, against Ullman, *Origin* 95 n. 6. See also P. Scarcia Piacentini, *Rev. d'Hist. Textes* 11 (1981) 123-146 and pl. I-II.
 28. *Imotski, Jugoslavia, Franciscan monastery, s.n.*: Cicero, opera varia. Copied for Francesco and Ermolao Barbaro, Venice 13 June 1422. Regoliosi, "Nuove ricerche II" 132-133 and tav. XII.1, Alexander — de la Mare, *The Italian MSS of Major Abbey* xxiv n. 4.: annotations by F. Barbaro.

29. *London, B.L. Harl. 5248*: Augustine, *De musica*. Copied at Venice 15 May 1423. Annotated by L. Giustiniani according to Dr de la Mare. Alexander — de la Mare *loc. cit.*, A. G. Watson, *Dated and datable MSS in British Library* I.145 no. 827, II pl. 373.
30. *Ravenna, B. Classense, 107*: Cicero, *De officiis*. Venetian decoration, probably of the 1420s. The heading of f.1 (all seen) attributed to Giovanni by Dr de la Mare.
31. *Florence, Laur. 76.1*: Cicero, *Philosophica*. The end of Poggio's copy of *Paradoxa stoicorum* completed by Giovanni on fols. 123v-124, presumably before 1418. De la Mare, *Handwriting* 77 no. 8.
32. *Paris, B.N. lat. 8537*: Cicero *Ad Brut.*, *Q.f.*, *Att.* Headings only probably by Giovanni. MS dated 1415 by "Redolfus Iohannis Misotis" of Ferrara. Florentine decoration. *Duke Humfrey and English humanism in the fifteenth century*, Bodleian Library exhibition catalogue, 1970, 2 no. 3.

Note: For some later manuscripts which may possibly be productions of Giovanni in the years 1440-1460, see the recent work of Dr de la Mare mentioned at n. 8 above.

Rejected

- i. *Vat. Bas. S. Petri H.31*: Plutarch *Alexander* and *Caesar*, bound with a Pomponius Mela by another hand. Signed and dated (13 Nov. 1414) by "Iohannes origine Florentinus ... qui Arretinus dicor". Ullman, *Origin* 93 no. 4 and pl. 47, Nicolaj Petronio 11 n. 32. The subscription, very similar to that of no. 8 above, is copied (like the text) in a gothic hand quite unlike any secure example of Giovanni's script: it was probably taken over from the exemplar.
- ii. *Berlin, lat. fol. 582*: Bruni, *varia*. Dated 1448 (f.29v) by "Ioannes Aretinus" (f.12). Baron, *Bruni Schriften* 237.
- iii. *Vat. Borg. lat. 341*: Cicero orations. Tentatively attributed to Giovanni by M. D. Reeve, *RFIC* 112 (1984) 269 n. 1.

et sunt illius scripta leuiora. ut urbanitas summa appareat doctrina mediocris. Ego autem quem timeam lectorem cum ad te ne grecis quidem cedentes in philosophia audeam scribere. Quamquam ipso id quidem facio prouocatus gratissimo mihi libro quem ad me de uirtute misisti. sed ex eo credo quibusdam uirtute usu. ut ab horreant a latinis. quod inciderunt inculta quedam et horrida de malis grecis letine scripta deterius. quibus ego assentior. dum modo de eisdem rebus ne grecos quidem legendos putet. res uero bonas uerbis electis grauiter ornateque dictatas. quis non legat. nisi qui se plane grecum dici uelit. ut a sceuola est pretor¹⁾ salutatus athensis albutius quem quidem iocum cum multa uenustate et omni sale idem lucilius. apud quem preclare sceuola. Grecum te albuti quam romanum atque fabium municipem potu tritannu centurionum preclarorum hominum ac primorum signiferumque malisti. cum ad me accedis. salutato

1) Vat. Ottob. lat. 1984 f. 3^v, hand attributed to Languschi by Sabbadini

17. Spente
 476 -- 486
 Preclaris viri atq; Magnifice, Desideroso ora habere la riformata dispositione
 matrimoniale et ordinis loco meo amico, Como io mi sentii ad ir de
 vrese passato, p nò habere habita riposa, ipso ala mia professione,
 havò dato tut finta ala mia vita. Et posti et spaciati e vnde ho
 recornuto. Ora como si sia stato a mi fransesco governo de vneque et
 la polcha, como pare x li ha mia q mtechuxa, piagnu d grata
 singulare, fur dno qta mtechuxa. E maderem la ditta dispensa
 Exensandome de la mia ptepeu la qual da singular amore e pvenuta
 el quado amore ma nò e senza ptepeu. Sa tutta nost d qd e ptepeu no,
 quado la ptepeu nost, da la pma ruder d cart d card. 185 d Ca bella.
 pagero Notem, Officium a voi. data venetiis die 17 Sept 1491
 Viri. Ja. de Languschi docto r d. n. pp. ptepeu

2) Florence, Archivio di Stato, MAP XI.471, autograph letter of Languschi (reduced). See p. 15 n. 59.

Terence O. TUNBERG

*THE LATINITY OF LORENZO
VALLA'S GESTA FERDINANDI REGIS ARAGONUM*

Like many other princes in fifteenth-century Italy, King Alfonso of Aragon, who established his court at Naples after 1442, maintained an entourage of humanists, who were expected to entertain and instruct the king with readings and lectures, and, if requested, to celebrate his glories in Latin writings¹. Among the literary works produced by this coterie was the *Gesta Ferdinandi regis Aragonum*, a history of the reign of Alfonso's father Ferdinand. It was written by Lorenzo Valla, one of the most famous humanists of the renaissance. The *Gesta*, completed in 1445, had a limited circulation and must be accounted one of Valla's minor creations². Nevertheless, it is of considerable interest to students of humanist Latin prose, since it is Valla's only full-scale narrative history.

Valla, of course, is famous both for his textual work on such Roman authors as Livy, and for his studies of the Latin language itself, especially for his monumental *Elegantiarum linguae latinae libri sex*, a work which enjoyed an enormous diffusion and which is of fundamental importance for our understanding of the subsequent history of Neo-Latin prose³. Valla considered the *Elegantiae* his greatest achievement,

¹ See A. F. Ryder, *The Kingdom of Naples under Alfonso the Magnanimous* (Oxford, 1976).

² *Laurentii Valle gesta Ferdinandi regis Aragonum*, ed. O. Besomi. *Thesaurus mundi* (Padova, 1973), pp. X-XV. M. Regoliosi fixes the date of the completion of the *Gesta* to the early summer of 1445. See *Laurentii Valle antidotum in Facium*, ed. M. Regoliosi. *Thesaurus mundi* (Padova, 1981), pp. XXXIX-XLV.

³ We still lack a modern critical edition of the *Elegantiae*. For this study I have used the Basel edition of 1540 by H. Petrus reprinted in L. Valla, *Opera omnia*, ed. E. Garin, vol. I, (Torino, 1962), pp. 3-235. For the circulation of the *Elegantiae*, see J. IJsewijn and G. Tournoy, "Un primo censimento dei manoscritti e delle edizioni a stampa degli 'Elegantiarum linguae latinae libri sex' di Lorenzo Valla", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 18 (1969), 25-41, and "Nuovi contributi per l'elenco dei manoscritti e delle edizioni delle *Elegantiae* di Lorenzo Valla", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 20 (1971), 1-3. We now know that

since he firmly believed that the indispensable foundation of all culture and learning was the correct use of the Latin language⁴.

In view of Valla's vital role in the history of Neo-Latin — indeed, it would probably be just to consider him the most important theorist of Neo-Latin prose — it is surprising that such little attention has been given to Valla's own latinity. The purpose of the present study is to make a modest contribution towards the appreciation of Valla as a Latin author by advancing some observations on the syntax and style of his *Gesta Ferdinandi regis Aragonum*. The *Gesta* is perhaps more interesting from this point of view than most of Valla's other writings, which are often quite technical in nature, since the *Gesta* was entirely designed to please a patron and it belongs to a well-defined literary genre, which had distinguished classical Latin antecedents — that of humanist Latin historiography. However, we must recognise the fact that conclusions about the *Gesta* will not necessarily be valid for Valla's latinity as whole. Like other writers, Valla probably underwent some development. And no studies yet exist which indicate whether or not Valla's Latin varied according to the genre in which he was writing.

In the following discussion, I shall make no rigid distinction between syntax and style. Instead, features which might be considered stylistic are freely discussed together with those that pertain, in a strict sense, to syntax. Because the edition of the *Gesta* by O. Besomi is based primarily on an autograph manuscript, and the editor provides a thorough analysis of Valla's spelling and word separation in his introduction, I shall not discuss Valla's orthography⁵. The following analysis will

the *Elegantiae* went through three major redactions, the last of which was not finished until 1449. See M. Regoliosi, "Le due redazioni delle 'Raudensiane note' e le 'Elegantiae' del Valla", in *Vestigia: Studi in onore di Giuseppe Billanovich*, edd. R. Avesani, M. Ferrari, T. Foffano, G. Frasso, A. Sottili, vol. 2 (Roma, 1984), pp. 559-73, and *Laurentii Valle epistole*, edd. O. Besomi and M. Regoliosi. Thesaurus mundi (Padova, 1984), pp. 22, 316-20, 322-5, 330-32, 357.

⁴ See *Elegantiae*, pref. I, p. 4, and the important remarks of D. Marsh, "Grammar, Method and Polemic in Lorenzo Valla's 'Elegantiae'", *Rinascimento* 19 (1979), 93.

⁵ The autograph manuscript is Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 6174. Besomi argues that this manuscript does not entirely represent the finished version which Valla wished to present to King Alfonso. Thus the editor incorporates into the text of the autograph a number of corrections, which are based on an archetype reconstructed from the other surviving copies. This archetype was not the copy dedicated to the King (now lost), but another copy, perhaps transcribed by Valla himself, which lies between the surviving autograph and the copy presented to King Alfonso. See Besomi's detailed discussion and stemma, *Gesta*, pp. LIV-LXX. For Valla's orthography see *Gesta*, pp. LXXI-LXXXVII, and *L. Valle epistole* (note 3), pp. 96-9. When citing the edition of the *Gesta*, I refer to book, chapter and section number, e.g. "casu" (1.8.4). In cases where my reference includes

concern Valla's use of language characteristic of poetry and "silver" Latin prose, as well as Valla's debt to late and medieval Latin. We shall give some attention to the influence of the Roman historians on the *Gesta*, and part of the discussion of this question will concern Valla's prose rhythm. We shall also examine features which seem to be his own idiosyncracies. But before we discuss these topics it will be worth while to consider some of Valla's own precepts on good prose style.

In the *Elegantiae*, Valla took the revolutionary step of denying the authority of the ancient grammarians and attempting to base his precepts concerning Latin usage entirely on the observed practice of the ancient authors themselves. Valla makes a distinction between *grammaticae loqui*, which is mere grammatical correctness, and *Latine loqui*, the pure and refined use of the Latin language⁶. His primary concern is the latter category, which is based not on the abstract principles of the grammarians, but the *consuetudo* of actual usage found in the best classical authors: "... quod ad elegant <i>am pertinet", Valla declares, "ego pro lege accipio quicquid magnis autoribus placuit"⁷. In view of this, we must ask which authors Valla considers to be best⁸. The following statement may be taken as representative of his approach in the *Elegantiae*.

"Neque in hoc toto meo opere tam licentiam poetarum consector, quam usum oratorum. Neque si quid aliter penes autores reperitur mihi obesse debet, qui non legem scribo, quasi nunquam aliter factum

no key words, I add page and line number, e.g. (1.8.4, p. 36.26). I also employ the following abbreviations: LHS = M. Leumann, J. B. Hofmann, A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, zweite Abteilung, zweiter Teil, zweiter Band (München, 1965); TLL = *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*; OLD = *Oxford Latin Dictionary*.

⁶ For example, see *Elegantiae*, 1.13, p. 19. The distinction is founded on Valla's interpretation of Quintilian, especially *Institutio oratoria* 1.6.27. See S. Camporeale, *Lorenzo Valla: Umanesimo e teologia* (Firenze, 1972), pp. 181-2.

⁷ On *Latine* vs. *grammaticae loqui* in Valla, see especially M. Tavoni, *Latino, grammatica, volgare. Storia di una questione umanistica* (Padova, 1984), pp. 121-65, who analyses Valla's position in the humanist controversy over the nature of vernacular speech in ancient Rome and its relation to the modern vernacular. See also Camporeale, *Valla*, pp. 150-90, and Marsh, "Grammar" (note 4), 104-7.

⁸ Though many humanists, such as Erasmus, succeeded in creating highly personal styles, imitation of classical writers is usually also an important factor to be considered in any evaluation of their works. See especially O. Kluge, "Die neulateinische Kunstprosa", *Glotta* 23 (1934-5), 18-20. For imitation in general, see G. W. Pigman III, "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance", *Renaissance Quarterly* 33 (1980), 1-32.

sit, sed quod frequentissime factitatum est, praesertim a Marco Tullio Marcoque Fabio..."⁹

Valla, therefore, can in no sense be considered a "Ciceronian", since he appears to give equal weight to the usages of the "Silver Age". The *exempla* from ancient authors cited in the *Elegantiae* fully support this statement. The vast majority of them are concentrated in the period of Latin literature between Caesar and Trajan. Valla does not favor early Latin or the comic poets as models for prose, and he is hostile to late Latin, with the partial exception of the Roman jurists of later Antiquity, whose precision and economy of expression Valla seems to admire. And since the chief purpose of the *Elegantiae* was to purify Latin from medievalisms, it is scarcely surprising that Valla retains this negative opinion for all authors of the Latin Middle Ages right up to the period just before his own lifetime¹⁰.

Throughout his life, Valla maintained this favorable attitude towards the prose of the Silver Age as well as that of the Ciceronian period. His youthful treatise on the comparison of Cicero and Quintilian caused a stir because it gave preference to the latter as a teacher of rhetoric. In his *Epistula ad Serram* (1440), Valla lists the authors which he considers exemplary¹¹. They include authors of the Silver Age as well as Varro, Cicero, Caesar and Sallust; the Roman jurists are mentioned with favor¹². In the *Antidotum primum in Poggium*, composed in 1452, Valla adheres to his praise of Quintilian as well as Cicero, and the language of both authors is favorably contrasted with late Latin¹³.

We should not, however, ignore the fact that Valla's statements about

⁹ 1.17, p. 22. See also 1.13, p. 19 (at the conclusion of the chapter).

¹⁰ Valla is rightly dissociated from the "Ciceronians" by R. Sabbadini, *La storia del ciceronianismo* (Torino 1885), pp. 26-32. For Valla's canon of *auctores*, the best study is still A. Casacci, "Gli 'Elegantiarum libri' di Lorenzo Valla", *Atene e Roma* 2d s., 7 (1926), 187-203. His conclusions are essentially confirmed by V. de Caprio, "La rinascita della cultura di Roma: la tradizione latina nelle 'Eleganze' di Lorenzo Valla", in *Umanesimo a Roma nel Quattrocento. Atti del Convegno su "Umanesimo a Roma nel Quattrocento"*, New York, 1-4 dicembre 1981, edited by P. Brezzi and M. de Panizza Lorch (Roma/New York, 1984), pp. 163-90.

¹¹ *L. Valle epistole* (note 3), pp. 197-8.

¹² The list of authors in this letter — which seems to be influenced by Book 10 of Quintilian — includes some who are not cited often in the *Elegantiae*. See de Caprio, "La rinascita" (note 10), pp. 186-7.

¹³ "Nec tam Romane loquitur Augustinus quam Cicero, nec tam Hilarius quam Quintilianus". L. Valla, *Antidotum primum*, ed. A. Wesseling. *Respublica literaria neerlandica* (Amsterdam, 1978), 1.146.

Latin usage are not always consistent. For example, some of Valla's remarks imply that poetic language should be avoided by prose writers¹⁴. Yet Valla sometimes defends poetic expressions¹⁵. In the *Elegantiae*, moreover, he frequently cites passages from Latin poetry. In fact Valla does not categorically exclude poetic expressions. It is primarily in those cases where poetic and prose usage conflict that Valla wishes to avoid poetic language¹⁶. We have already noted that Valla advocates usages which are more common, even where examples to the contrary may be found¹⁷. Nevertheless, on occasion we find him voicing preference for obscure or rare expressions¹⁸. Finally, it should be noted that there are exceptions to Valla's rule that the observed practice of the *auctores* constitutes law. Several of Valla's precepts in the *Elegantiae* are actually attempts to "rationalise" the practice of ancient writers, and do not therefore represent the full diversity of actual usage — even within the period considered exemplary¹⁹.

Thus Valla's precepts contain an element of subjectivity which cannot be discounted. In general, however, Valla's theoretical point of view might be summarised as follows. The best models for Neo-Latin prose are the prose authors from the periods of Cicero and Quintilian. On the whole, late Latin writers should not be imitated. Poetic language should be avoided in cases where it departs from what is acceptable in prose.

Returning to consider the *Gesta Ferdinandi regis Aragonum*, we shall note first that Valla shows a predilection for constructions and expres-

¹⁴ One such instance is *Antidotum secundum in Poggium* (1453), in *Opera* (note 3), vol. 1, p. 328: "Itane tu prosa oratione scribens iis vocabulis uteris, quibus non oratores aut historici, sed poetae utuntur, nec poetae omnes, sed unus tantum, qui etsi maximus est, tamen summae in loquendo licentiae ..."

¹⁵ See, for example, *Antidotum in Facium* (note 2), 1.15.12-13. "... O caper, ne dicam capram, qui fieri potest ut quia poetice quid dictum sit inelegans? quasi poete ceteris scriptoribus loquantur incultius et non potius excultius". In the same work (composed in 1447), Valla calls the poets "genus hominum inter scriptores omnes eloquendi studiosissimum" (*Antidotum in Facium*, 2.5.20).

¹⁶ The point is justly made by A. Casacci, "Gli 'Elegantiarum libri' (note 10)", 201.

¹⁷ See the passage cited above, note 9.

¹⁸ For example, see *Antidotum in Facium* (note 2), 2.1.37: "Sed sane sint eo usu rarissime auctores, nonne satis est hoc mihi pro defensione quod usu sunt?"

¹⁹ See L. Cesarini Martinelli, "Note sulla polemica Poggio-Valla e sulla fortuna delle *Elegantiae*", *Interpres* 3 (1980), 67-79. Note especially Cesarini Martinelli's discussion of *Elegantiae* 1.13 (on the nature of the comparative and superlative), and *Elegantiae* 2.1 (on *mei*, *tui* and *sui*).

sions which are typical of Silver Latin prose (often beginning with Livy), and which are either rare or unattested in the Ciceronian period (though some appear in early Latin)²⁰. Habitual with Valla is the use of *quam pro* after a comparative, for example "... magis quam pro valitudine corporis hodie ... laboravi" (2.3.12), a mode of expression which is absent from prose before Livy²¹. Valla employs *forem*, as equivalent to *essem*, with the gerundive or gerund, another feature of Silver prose introduced by Livy (LHS, pp. 312-313), for example "producenda ... foret" (1.17.2), "optandum foret" (2.13.10), "renuntiandum ... foret" (3.10.7), etc. On several occasions Valla uses the phrase *recepta opinio* (e.g., 1.1.1, 2.6.12, 3.7.4), where *recepta* means "established", and he employs the phrase "professa ... ambitio" (3.8.6), in which *professa* means "open" or "undisguised"; neither word seems to have been used this way in prose before the Silver Age (TLL, 9.2; 719.79-80 and OLD, p. 1475). "Apud te ipsum non videris esse" (3.13.4), an expression for losing one's mind, is found in comedy, post-Augustan prose and in late Latin (TLL, 2; 342.30-37). *Consilia coquere* (3.1.3) appears in early Latin, in poetry, in Livy and in Silver prose (TLL, 4; 928.21-50). Noteworthy is *facere ad* meaning "to be useful for" or "to avail" (3.2.4), which is poetic and only found in post-Augustan prose (TLL, 6.1; 122.42-123.15). Also poetic are *terram legere* (3.10.6) meaning "hug the coastline", and *appellere* with the dative meaning "to land", e.g., "priusquam litori appellant" (1.6.5): both expressions appear in Livy and the prose of the imperial age (TLL, 2; 275.61-276.42 and 7.2; 1127.50-1128.18). Valla uses *erumpere* with the simple ablative of separation and no preposition, e.g., "proxima petra fluviis ... erumpens" (1.9.3), "porta ... erumpit" (1.11.6), "erumpebant omnibus lacrimae" (3.5.15), which occurs in poetry and, introduced to prose by Sallust and Livy, is common in the post-Augustan period (TLL, 5.2; 836.4-843.49, especially 837.28-42)²², *incidere* with the simple accusative and without

²⁰ I do not include in this category such phrases as *inexploratum habere* (1.6.1). Although the adjective *inexploratus* is only common in Silver prose and later (Thesaurus, 7.1; 1329.56-1330.25), Valla's phrase is undoubtedly modelled on *exploratum habere*, which is well attested in both Cicero and Caesar.

²¹ The best discussion is still O. Riemann, *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Tite-Live*, 2^e éd. (Paris, 1884), p. 275, who cites Caesar (B.G., 1.2.5) by way of contrast: "pro multitudine autem hominum et pro gloria belli atque fortitudinis, angustos se fines habere arbitrabantur", instead of *angustiores ... quam pro ...* For some other examples in the *Gesta*, see "minus quam pro merito" (1.4.5); "maioris quam pro etate" (1.12.5); "erectiore quam pro viribus" (2.12.19); "magis quam pro viribus" (3.10.2).

²² Caesar uses the simple ablative, but with a reflexive, e.g.: "... hostes portis se foras

in, e.g., “incidemus perturbationem” (1.14.7), which is used by Lucretius, but does not appear again until Tacitus (TLL, 7.1; 905.67-906.26)²³; *interfluere* employed in a transitive sense with the simple accusative, e.g., “... populos quos Hiberus interfluit” (1.2.13), which, in prose, appears earliest in Livy and then in Silver Age authors (TLL, 7.1; 2195.71-84); *invadere* with the simple accusative and without *in*, e.g., “incautosque ... invadit” (1.11.6), “vos nisi incautos ... invadere” (1.12.9), “plures canes ... invadere” (1.13.6), a Silver Latin usage introduced to prose by Sallust and Livy (TLL, 7.2, 108.54-115.39); *suadere* with the accusative of person, e.g., “qui ceteros ... suaderent” (2.14.1), a construction found in Silver and late Latin (LHS, p. 33). In the *Gesta*, we observe *gratia* preceding its genitive, e.g., “gratia predandi” (1.11.4), first used in prose by Quintilian (LHS 133); *inter* with the gerund or gerundive to denote temporal action, e.g., “inter natandum” (2.12.11), which is found occasionally in early Latin, but chiefly in Livy, in Silver prose and in late Latin (TLL, 7.1; 2130.75-2131.9)²⁴, *citra* with the accusative, meaning “without” (e.g., 2.5.6, 2.10.5, 3.10.7, 3.11.4), which appears in poetry and Silver Age prose (LHS, p. 228)²⁵.

Contentus with the infinitive (1.8.6) for *eo contentus quod* is a poetic construction found in post-Augustan prose (TLL, 4; 680.15-64). The same is true of *compellere* with the infinitive (1.13.5), which is also common in late Latin (TLL, 3; 2034.12-2035.70). *Incurrere* with the simple accusative meaning to “incur” or “commit”, e.g., “eum ... proditionis crimen incurrere” (3.2.14), appears in Apuleius and later prose authors (TLL, 7.1; 1087.38-1088.56). *Praecipere* equivalent to *iubere* with the accusative and infinitive (1.3.7, 3.10.11) is attested in Silver and late Latin (TLL, 10.2; 449.11-47). The same can be said of *indulgere* with the dative and accusative equivalent to *dare alicui aliquid* (3.5.10), which is also cited once in Livy (TLL, 7.1; 1253.19-1255.4). *Mandare* meaning “command” and used with the accusative and infinitive, e.g., “... ut vexillum ... afferri mandet” (3.3.1), is attested mostly in Silver Age authors (TLL, 8; 263.65-6, 73-4; 264.15-16, 39-43, 77-84:

erumpunt” (B.C., 2.14.1). In this passage “se” has been disputed: but cf. Cicero, *Ad fam.*, 8.14.2 (Caelius Ciceroni): “... ad bellum se erupit”.

²³ It is possible that Valla could have found *incidere* without the preposition in manuscripts containing Cicero, *Ad fam.*, 2.7.2 and 3.9.4. Both passages, however, have been emended.

²⁴ See also *Elegantiae*, 1.27, p. 34 and 3.91, p. 116.

²⁵ See also *Elegantiae* 2.49, p. 74, where Valla himself notes that this use of *citra* belongs to the period after Cicero.

265.77-266.17). Valla is fond of *iubere* with the subjunctive, either with or without *ut*, e.g., “*iubet ut ... parati sint*” (1.11.1), also (1.15.7), (2.8.16), (2.13.15), (2.16.7), (3.3.1), a usage occasionally found in classical prose, but which is common in comedy, poetry, Silver prose (beginning with Livy) and in late Latin (TLL, 7.2; 579.73-581.30)²⁶. We also note *vereri* with the accusative and infinitive (2.9.15 and 3.5.11), which seems not to be found in prose before Livy (LHS, p. 358); *differre* with the infinitive, e.g., “*satiù putarunt differre per noctis tempus expugnare eos*” (1.12.4), which appears in poetry, Livy and Silver prose, and especially in late Latin (TLL, 5.1; 1074.65-1075.11); *impetro* with the infinitive, e.g., “*spatium dari impetrat*” (2.16.7), “*impetrat ... accommodari*” (3.3.2), an uncommon construction found only in Tacitus, Fronto, Tertullian, Roman law, and other late writers (TLL, 7.1; 602.30-42). The use of the perfect participle of a deponent verb in an ablative absolute to govern an object, e.g., “*hec locuto rege*” (2.12.15), is avoided by Caesar and Cicero. Introduced to prose by Sallust and Livy, it becomes common in Silver and late Latin (LHS, p. 139)²⁷.

Securus with the genitive, e.g., “*secura maris et frigoris*” (2.15.7), is only attested in Silver prose and later (LHS, p. 78). *Diversus* with the dative, e.g., “*... eisdem ... diversa desideramus*” (3.2.4), with the possible exception of an example in Caesar, is found in poetry and in prose not before the Silver Age (TLL, 5.1; 1583.13-36). Likewise, the adverbial expression *e diverso* used often by Valla (e.g., 2.4.1, 2.9.1, 2.14.6, 2.4.13), belongs to poetry and Silver Latin prose (TLL, 5.1; 1585.66-1586.8). In the *Gesta*, *invicem* sometimes means “mutually”, e.g., “*arcto invicem complexu ... sese deiecerunt*” (1.15.9), which occurs first in prose in Livy, and then becomes usual in Silver prose (LHS, p. 177)²⁸.

Valla constantly treats *itaque* and *namque* as postpositives, e.g., “*raro namque*” (*praef.* 14), “*relinque itaque*” (1.8.8), “*observato itaque tempore*” (1.14.11), etc. With the exception of one instance of *itaque* postpositive in *Ad Herennium* (1.11.8), this habit begins in Livy and

²⁶ It should be noted that Valla also uses *iubere* with the infinitive (e.g., 1.11.8).

²⁷ Note also “*minabundus se monstraturum illi ...*” (2.13.19). The use of an adjective with the ending *-bundus* governing an object is also foreign to Caesar and Cicero. See the discussion in Riemann, *Études* (note 21), p. 261. On adjectives with the ending *-bundus*, see also *Elegantiae*, 1.9, pp. 12-13.

²⁸ See also 1.9.2. Valla also uses *invicem* to mean “in turn” or “successively” (e.g., 1.6.7, 1.13.1). In the *Elegantiae*, Valla recognises both meanings of *invicem* (2.59, p. 79).

becomes common in Silver Age prose (LHS, pp. 506, 514)²⁹. The use of *que ... que* instead of *et ... et* to connect words is archaic and poetic and, introduced to prose by Sallust, it is attested in Silver Age prose, though the use of *que ... que* to link two clauses does not appear in prose before Tacitus. Similarly *que ... atque* is first used in prose by Livy, then taken up by the prose authors of the imperial age. *Que ... et* is likewise archaic and poetic and avoided by Caesar and Cicero — though not by the author of the anonymous *Bellum Africanum* (LHS, pp. 515-16). Valla employs all of these pairs in the *Gesta*³⁰. We read, for example: “magnoque cum periculo, multisque cum vulneribus” (1.5.6); “pretorque ... atque archiepiscopus” (2.4.9); “signaque et macule” (2.5.5); “captivusque et ... omni spe vacuus” (3.5.18); “locum tempusque atque alia” (3.8.4); “probusque ac strenuus” (3.15.7), etc. Similarly, *nunc ... nunc* instead of *modo ... modo*, which is absent from prose before Livy (LHS, p. 520), is used throughout Valla’s *Gesta* (e.g., 1.9.4, 1.16.6, 2.14.6, 3.5.4, 3.10.2). *Nec* can be equivalent to *ne ... quidem*, e.g., “qui sepe dixerit nolle se regni ius auferre ei cuius foret nec si centum alia sibi regna adeptum iri existimaret” (2.4.13), a usage which becomes established in Silver Age prose (LHS, p. 450) and is attested also in the prose of the humanist period³¹. We note *necdum* used instead of *nondum*, e.g., “... hominis, quem ut necdum virum in societatem admittere noluerant” (1.12.13), which appears in Livy and Silver Age prose (LHS, p. 449). We encounter *non* for *ne* with the hortatory subjunctive (1.8.6) and *ne* for *ut non* expressing a negative result (3.2.5). Examples of the former can be found in many periods, but the latter form of negation begins in Silver Latin and is common in late Latin (LHS, pp. 337-8, 535, 641-2). Sometimes Valla has *quo* instead of *ut* introducing a final clause, although the clause contains no comparative, e.g. “... quo

²⁹ See *Elegantiae* 2.54 and 2.55, p. 76, where Valla sanctions the use of *namque* and *itaque* either as postpositives or the first word.

³⁰ See also *Elegantiae*, 2.58, p. 78, where Valla declares that *que ... que* is rare in prose and more common in poetry.

³¹ In the prose of Erasmus, for example. See D. F. S. Thomson, “The Latinity of Erasmus”, in *Erasmus*, ed. T. A. Dorey (London, 1970), p. 133. In the *Elegantiae* (2.58, p. 78), Valla recognises that this use of *nec* is post-Ciceronian. It is interesting to note that in the same chapter of the *Elegantiae*, Valla also says “... admonendum est, ‘et’ pro ‘etiam’ apud Ciceronem nusquam reperiri, sicut in caeteris illo posterioribus”. Valla happens to be mistaken in this case (*et = etiam* is not infrequent in Cicero: see TLL, 5.2; 906.76ff.). But it is more important to observe that his belief this use of *et* is not Ciceronian seems to be no deterrent to his own very frequent use of *et* this way in the *Gesta*; e.g., “que et ipsa discrepat” (1.2.16); “Quam vocem admirati universi, et ipsi subsecuti sunt clamantes ...” (1.4.6), etc.

pedites procurrere ... possent" (1.16.5), also (1.6.7), (2.1.4), (2.13.22) and (3.5.3)³². This archaism is introduced to prose by Sallust, but is very common in the Silver Age, particularly in Tacitus (LHS, pp. 679-80), and it is well attested in the latinity of a number of humanists after Valla³³.

Valla employs the iterative subjunctive for repeated action in such phrases as "quem ... is nuncupaverit ... pro rege habetur" (1.4.2) or "quotiens quippiam vacaret" (3.15.10), which is attested in Livy and common in later prose authors (LHS, p. 562)³⁴. Also noteworthy is the indicative in causal relative clauses introduced by *quippe* e.g., "postremi non tam cito vertentes terga, quippe qui rem non videbant" (1.13.8), also (2.13.11), (3.15.10), an archaism introduced by Sallust and common in Silver prose (LHS, p. 560)³⁵. We find *quamvis* with the indicative (1.8.7) and *perinde atque* with the subjunctive instead of *perinde ac si* (3.2.4), both characteristic of Silver Age prose (LHS, pp. 604, 675)³⁶.

It would be easy to attribute all of this to the fact that in the mid-fifteenth century knowledge about the distinctions between different periods of Latin expression was still very limited. The science of philology, as we know it, was just beginning, and the ancient texts available to scholars were sometimes quite corrupt. However, as we have already noted repeatedly, the *Elegantiae* shows that in many cases Valla was perfectly aware that some usages are later than others, and when he adopts these same expressions in his own writing, this confirms his preferences. In the *Elegantiae*, Valla correctly observes that the future participle used to denote purpose or intention is characteristic of post-Augustan prose³⁷. We often encounter this idiom in the *Gesta*, e.g., "...

³² Valla also uses *quo* with a comparative, see 1.4.3, 2.13.2, 3.5.5.

³³ See Thomson, "The Latinity of Erasmus" (note 31), p. 133. And for other northern humanists, I cite pp. 15-16, 23 of the typescript of "The Latin Style of Julius Pflug", by D. F. S. Thomson, which will appear in *Pflugiana*, ed. J. V. Pollet, Saecula spiritalia (Baden Baden).

³⁴ But Valla also uses the indicative for iterative action, e.g. "Ubi que sibi successerunt prospera scelere nostrorum, ea divinitus evenisse interpretantur" (1.8.3); "Qualia quotiens olim contingebant" (3.4.4).

³⁵ Valla does the same with *ut qui*; see 2.15.7. See also *Elegantiae*, 2.27, p. 63, where Valla allows *quippe qui* with either indicative or subjunctive. (For *ut qui* see *Elegantiae*, 2.28, p. 64).

³⁶ In the *Elegantiae* (2.21, p. 58), Valla declares that *quamvis* takes either the indicative or subjunctive. In the same work (2.50, p. 74), contrary to the example from the *Gesta* cited above, he maintains that *perinde* requires *ac si*, when used with the subjunctive for hypothetical comparisons.

³⁷ See *Elegantiae*, 1.27, p. 34. As with many trends in later prose, the freer use of the

in Aragoniam ... iter intendit, diadema accepturus" (3.7.1). Indeed, Valla uses it so frequently that it almost seems to be an affectation³⁸. Like Silver Latin writers, Valla employs the future participle with *tamquam* meaning "on the ground that" or "as though" (like the Greek ὥς), e.g., "eo hic nuntio letatus tanquam aliquid quo gauderet ab amico auditurus, conscenso mulo, obviam egressus est ..." (2.7.17)³⁹. Similarly, in the *Elegantiae*, Valla declares that the ablative for duration of time is typical of post-Augustan authors, and we find that Valla habitually employs the ablative for duration in the *Gesta*⁴⁰. Although Valla does not invariably choose constructions from the prose of the imperial age⁴¹, the fact that he does so freely when he wishes is significant.

This predilection for Silver age prose is also evident in the structure of Valla's sentences. Sometimes he employs a very loose sort of apposition, in which the appositional phrase refers to the idea contained in a whole

future participle really begins with Livy, see LHS, p. 390 and Riemann, *Études* (note 21), pp. 303-5.

³⁸ See, for example, 1.7.4, p. 34.2; 1.7.8, p. 34.32; 1.8.8, p. 38.12; 1.8.9, p. 38.24; 1.9.8, p. 43.6; 1.11.4, p. 48.25; 1.12.4, p. 55.1; 1.15.7, p. 67.15; 1.19.18, p. 82.29; 2.2.7, p. 87.24; 2.8.18, p. 114.19; 2.13.21, p. 132.18; 3.2.7, p. 147.27-8 and p. 148.3; 3.4.1, p. 153.5; 3.8.5, p. 165.31; 3.10.5, p. 169.29. In the *Elegantiae* (*ibid.*), Valla compares *venio petiturus* with *venio* *petiturus*, noting that the latter is the later construction. Though Valla obviously favors the future participle in the *Gesta*, he sometimes uses the supine for purpose after verbs of motion, e.g., "missas ... nuntiatum" (1.6.1), and see also 2.12.8, pp. 125.27-126.1; 2.12.14, p. 126.26-7; 2.12.17, p. 127.19.

³⁹ See also 1.7.7, p. 34.20; 1.14.12, p. 64.28-9; 2.5.1, p. 99.11. Valla also uses the future participle without any form of *esse* in hypothetical conditions, another construction found in Silver prose, e.g., "res omnibus, nisi Hieronymus tradidisset, futura ignota" (1.2.4), and also 1.9.7, pp. 42.28-43.2.

⁴⁰ Valla distinguishes between duration of time and time within (+ ablative). He does not accept the view that the accusative for duration denotes continuous time, and the ablative for duration denotes interrupted time. He observes that in either case ("indifferenter") Cicero and Vergil more often use the accusative for duration, while later authors for the most part prefer the ablative. See *Elegantiae*, 3.53, p. 107, *Antidotum primum* (note 13), 3.269-70, and *Adnotationes in errores A. Raudensis, Opera*, 1, p. 403. Valla's rule is, as a general statement, not incorrect. However, under some circumstances the ablative is used for duration in classical prose (see LHS, pp. 41, 148). For some examples of the ablative for duration in the *Gesta*, see 1.2.1, p. 11.3; 1.3.8, p. 21.29; 1.6.3, p. 29.20-1; 1.9.1, p. 40.30; 2.4.5, p. 96.29; 2.12.14, p. 126.29; 2.15.3, p. 137.16; 3.10.6, p. 170.2; 3.10.7, p. 170.17; 3.10.8, pp. 170.29-171.1. There is at least one clear instance of the accusative (2.11.1, p. 121.11), but the ablative is obviously preferred.

⁴¹ See also *Elegantiae*, 1.27, p. 34, where Valla classifies *rogatum te velim* as an early Latin construction. We repeatedly notice this in the *Gesta*, e.g., "regnum puero datum volebat" (1.4.2); "qui te perditum vellent" (1.8.7); "regem Castelle vel destructum vel deminutum vellent" (1.19.9). In fact, however, this usage does not belong to early Latin alone, it is common in Livy and the Silver Age (LHS, p. 352).

proposition rather than to a single word, for example, “quod gaudium oculorum ... meorum... erit, si in hac aviditate atque in hac spe tollende prolis videamus domi versari alienum puerum, quasi nostri regni, idest nostre orbitatis heredem, haud dubie infaustum omen et acerbum augurium?” (2.2.10). Here “haud dubie ...” etc., has reference to the whole action “domi versari alienum puerum, quasi ... heredem”, a rather compact mode of expression which is essentially foreign to the language of Cicero or Caesar⁴². Sallust employs this sort of apposition, but it is greatly extended and very common in Silver prose (LHS, pp. 429-30).

In short, Valla admired many Silver Age prose authors and adopted in his own writing many of the usages of that period, which he considered to be equally “classical” and legitimate as those of the Ciceronian era. The same assertion cannot be made about the traces of late and medieval latinity which can be found throughout the *Gesta*. Valla was in the forefront of the humanist struggle to throw off the medieval Latin inheritance, and his *Elegantiae* was a fundamental contribution to the whole movement. It is, therefore, perhaps surprising at first to notice in the *Gesta* such phrases as: “cum auxilia bellorum aliarumque rerum magnarum a populis nostris corrogare habeamus” (3.2.10), where *habere* is virtually equivalent to *debere*. Valla repeatedly uses *habere* in this medieval way⁴³. *Deferre* meaning “to grant”, “to

⁴² We find this quite often in the *Gesta*. See, for example, “res omnibus ... ignota” (1.2.4); “... magnum opus et laboriosum” (1.5.5); “quippe ad proditionem facillima occasio” (1.5.7); “res mira dictu” (1.11.14); “dignum ... risu spectaculum ...” in apposition with the following sentence beginning “mulieres” (2.15.8); “res levis atque inanis” (3.2.4).

⁴³ E.g., “vos ... singillatim hortari habeo” (1.17.8); “precarique habeo celestem regem” (2.2.6); “quo magis ... admonere te habeo” (3.12.9). For this use of *habere*, see LHS p. 320, and A. S. Gratwick, “*Habeo* and *Aveo*: the Romance Future”, *Classical Quarterly* n.s. 22 (1972), 388-98. Valla's use of *habere* in this sense is confirmed by *Elegantiae* 5.98, p. 195, where he reads “tantum habeo polliceri” (Cicero, *Ad fam.*, 1.5a.3) with this meaning. According to modern authorities, however, *habere* in this passage means “to have the capacity to” and is roughly equivalent to *posse* (TLL, 6.3; 2438.27-33 and 2454.26-7). Valla quotes several other examples from classical and Silver Latin, which have either been emended or are interpreted differently by modern scholars, with the exception of “quid habeo aliud deos precari quam ut ...” from Suetonius, *Augustus*, 58.2, which is among the very rare Silver Latin examples of *habere* = *debere* cited in the Thesaurus (TLL, 6.3; 2454.53-2455.64). However, several commentaries on Suetonius' *Augustus* (e.g. E. S. Shuckburgh [Cambridge, 1896]) argue that *habere* in this passage has the same force as in the example from *Ad fam.* cited above.

yield", or "to defer", e.g. "quod nunc negant, id ultro postea delaturos" (3.13.1), is a usage of late Latin (TLL, 5.1; 320.75-321.21). Similarly, the use of *inquit* to introduce *oratio obliqua* (3.6.3.) is rare before late Latin (LHS, p. 357: TLL, 7.1; 1778.67-1779.23). *Comedere* with *de* and the ablative instead of an accusative object (2.5.5) and *confidere* with the preposition *in*, e.g., "in alienis precibus ... confidere" (3.5.11), are also late Latin (TLL, 3; 1765.28-74 and 1766.26-34: 4; 208.39-54). Valla uses *applicare* in the medieval way to denote arrival at a place by land (and not by sea), e.g., "pater puelle cum applicuit" (1.15.7), "ii fere sub idem tempus applicuerunt ad oppidum ... quo Ioannes Ferrandis applicuit ... Saguntum (2.8.13)⁴⁴. In the *Gesta, carruca* (1.9.6) does not mean "carriage", but it has the medieval Latin meaning "pulley"⁴⁵. Noteworthy also is *commisceri* meaning "to be confused" (1.13.8)⁴⁶. Valla often uses the shifted perfect passive — or perfect of deponents — with forms of *fuisse* instead of *esse*, e.g. "fuisse miseratos" (1.15.10); "exclusos ... fuisse" (2.3.22); "multatos ... fuisse" (2.7.15); "direpta fuisset" (2.9.15); "optatum speratumque ... fuisse" (2.11.15); "reductam fuisse" (2.13.17); "ingressi fuerunt" (3.4.4); "fuisset expertus" (3.15.3)⁴⁷.

Valla frequently employs the indicative for indirect questions, e.g., "cum legimus quid egerunt dixeruntque Nestor, Agamemnon ..." (*prae*f. 6) or "quid apud hostes agitur, explorent" (1.6.1), a construction which occurs in Roman comedy and is occasionally found in the classical period, but is very common throughout late and medieval Latin (LHS, pp. 527-8)⁴⁸. A related phenomenon is Valla's habit of lapsing into the

⁴⁴ See J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae latinitatis lexicon minus* (Leiden, 1976), p. 52A.

⁴⁵ See A. Blaise, *Lexicon latinitatis medii aevi*. Corpus christianorum, continuatio mediaevalis (Turnhout, 1975), p. 152A.

⁴⁶ Similar uses of the verb are cited in *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch*, 2.7, ed. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften und Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR (München, 1976), p. 986B, lines 4-8.

⁴⁷ The use of *fueram* instead of *eram* for the pluperfect passive is already frequent in Sallust and Livy, but the forms *laudatus fui* and *laudatus fuissem*, at least in prose, belong to late and medieval Latin. The infinitive form *laudatus fuisse* is somewhat less rare (LHS, pp. 321-2, 324, 352, 394). Examples in classical Latin of a past participle with *fui*, *fueram*, etc., usually occur when the participle expresses a state in the past, or is used with adjectival force. See J. Lebreton, *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron* (Paris, 1901), pp. 203-7, Riemann, *Études* (note 21), pp. 225-6, and LHS, p. 394. The use of the shifted perfect is well attested in humanist Latin in the century after Valla's lifetime. D. F. S. Thomson notes it in the Latin of Erasmus and Julius Pflug: see "The Latinity of Erasmus" (note 31), p. 134, and "The Latin Style of Julius Pflug" (note 33), typescript, pp. 23-4.

⁴⁸ See also 1.13.6, p. 60.20-1; 1.13.10, p. 61.23; 3.2.10, p. 148.21; 3.2.13, p. 149.10-11; 3.4.1, p. 152.28-9; 3.12.8, p. 177.25; 3.12.12, p. 179.3-4. Noteworthy is "admirabantur omnium oculi unde tot sine vectoribus equos" (1.13.10), with *admiror* taking the accusative

indicative in the subordinate clauses of long sequences in *oratio obliqua*, as in the following passage:

"Non enim preponi illegitimum legitimis se postulare, sed eum pro legitimo esse. Qui, cum alii nulli potiores sint, nulli iniuriam facturus est neque plane esse illegitimum ex patre celibe ac matre innupta genitum. Hoc si in privatis semper valuit, multo magis debere valere in regibus, quos sola contentos uxore esse vix postulandum est, et in bellis aut longinquis regionibus agentes, ut uxores habeant fieri non potest. Neque exclusos a successione fuisse filios ancillarum Iacob, neque eandem causam Salomoni obstitisse, quominus ad regnum tolleretur, cum tamen non modo solus qualis Federicus, sed ne primus quidem ex David liberis esset, et alia plurima omnibus ex gentibus huius generis exempla (2.3.22).⁴⁹

In the works of Caesar and Cicero (as well as in Livy) it is possible to find occasional instances of the indicative in the subordinate clauses of *oratio obliqua* which are difficult to explain as parenthetical insertions or mere explanatory circumlocutions. Sometimes, especially in Cicero, clauses are placed in the indicative for greater emphasis, or to contrast reality with another clause in the subjunctive denoting hypothesis, or indirect speech may be abandoned in mid-sequence⁵⁰. However, the majority of the instances which have been noted occur with a main verb in the present. In Valla's case, by contrast, the main verb (expressed or implied) is normally in a past tense, and his lapses into the indicative appear to be much more extensive than the examples cited in Caesar or Cicero, or in Livy. It is probably safe to assume that this reflects the influence of medieval Latin, since there is no doubt that the use of the indicative in this way becomes much freer in late Latin (LHS, pp. 547-8)⁵¹.

in spite of *unde*. We also find the subjunctive and indicative in close juxtaposition: "... parvi interest scire quid intus quesitum *sit*, cum sciamus quid propalam declaratum *est*" (2.11.3). Could this shift to the indicative be the unconscious result of Valla's emphatic contrast of uncertainty with certainty?

⁴⁹ For the entire sequence in *oratio obliqua*, see 2.3.20-2. For a similar example, see the whole passage from "Vix recepta ..." to "... agitat" (2.13.22). Instances of this kind should be contrasted with cases where Valla's use of the indicative in subordinate clauses in *oratio obliqua* represents the author's insertion of a remark which is not really part of the indirect speech, as in classical Latin, e.g., "quod illi parlamentum vocant" (2.7.3).

⁵⁰ See the discussions by Lebreton, *Études* (note 47), pp. 365-72, and Riemann, *Études* (note 21), p. 290.

⁵¹ In the *Gesta* we also find the following unusual subjunctive instead of an accusative and infinitive, or possibly a *quod/quia* clause: "In quo illud precipue admirabantur, ... tam modico exiguoque contentus foret" (2.10.6).

In addition to subordinate clauses in the indicative, the extended passages of *oratio obliqua* in the *Gesta* often contain shifts from primary to secondary sequence (or vice-versa), many of which seem to be quite arbitrary⁵². In some cases, however, Valla's shifts from secondary to primary sequence can be explained as the author's tendency to retain in *oratio obliqua* the tense of an original subjunctive in direct speech. For example:

"Nitebatur ... probare ... verum se papam esse ... Nam se unum omnium esse indubitatum cardinalem ab indubitato creatum papa, cum ceteri, qui se eodem nomine appellarent, creati essent tempore schismatis: ut incertum sit, an veri sint cardinales, et ob id, an rite deligere summum pontificem possint" (3.10.7).

Here the entire indirect discourse has been maintained in secondary sequence, but changes to primary sequence with the consecutive clause "ut incertum sit", thus preserving the tense of the subjunctive as it would have been in *oratio recta*⁵³.

Irregular treatment of tense sequence is frequently cited as a characteristic of medieval and renaissance latinity. However, it should be pointed out that, as far as long speeches in *oratio obliqua* are concerned, the Roman historians themselves did not provide their humanist successors with very consistent models. Caesar frequently shifts from historic to primary sequence — even within the same speech⁵⁴. Various reasons

⁵² See, for example, 2.3.21-2, part of which is quoted above for Valla's habit of slipping into the indicative. At 1.4.3, after erratic shifts of subjunctive tenses ("adoleverit ... daretur ... sit ... sit evasurus ... assit ... esset ... sit") the discourse settles into primary sequence. For similar shifts of tense sequence in the same *oratio obliqua*, see 1.8.5, 2.7.5, 2.9.2-3, 3.6.3-4, 3.11.4, 3.11.7, 3.13.1-3. In many of these passages we also note the indicative in subordinate clauses.

⁵³ See also 2.9.2-3, where the *oratio obliqua* begins in primary sequence, shifts to secondary sequence with "cogitare", then a consecutive clause brings a shift back to primary sequence with "ut ... non possit, etc." (See ahead, note 136 for "sociis"). At 3.10.2, the discourse shifts from secondary sequence to "cum ... possit", which may be the retention of an original subjunctive if the meaning of *cum* here is causal rather than temporal. For other examples, see "faciat" (2.7.3) and perhaps "si moriendum sit" (3.11.7). It must be stressed, though, that this appears to be merely a tendency, and it is certainly not a principle which can be applied to every change of tense sequence in *oratio obliqua* in the *Gesta*.

⁵⁴ See especially the valuable studies by M. Andrewes, "The Function of Tense Variation in the Subjunctive Mood of *Oratio Obliqua*", *The Classical Review* n.s. 1 (1951), 142-5, and id., "Caesar's use of Tense Sequence in Indirect Speech", *The Classical Review* 51 (1937), 114-16. There are also many circumstances when conventional sequence is not followed in Cicero's prose, see Lebreton, *Études* (note 47), pp. 224-78, and in Cicero's philosophical works, just as in the works of the Roman historians, it is possible to find abrupt shifts of tense sequence in *oratio obliqua* (*ibid.*, pp. 273-8).

are suggested, such as emphasis of a new point of view, introduction of a statement of general truth, the attempt to represent distinctions of tense and mood in *oratio recta*, but some of his shifts in sequence remain difficult to explain. Sallust generally adheres to conventional secondary sequence, except where use of the historic present causes variations. But sometimes he employs the present subjunctive of *repraesentatio* (change of point of view from reporter to speaker) for commands in *oratio obliqua*⁵⁵. Livy very often uses the primary tenses of the subjunctive, even with a historical tense of the main verb, and this probably reflects the author's desire to retain the tenses of direct speech. Tacitus' use of *oratio obliqua* is very complex and resists attempts at classification. It has been argued, however, that his numerous deviations from the conventional tense sequence are often motivated by a desire to represent shifts of mood rather than tense in *oratio recta*⁵⁶. Thus it should hardly surprise us that Valla's treatment of tense sequence in long indirect speeches is often quite erratic⁵⁷. Rules for sequence of tenses, as we know them, had not yet been formulated in the fifteenth century. Indeed the subject was not extensively discussed in grammar books until the nineteenth century⁵⁸. And it must be kept in mind that the modern rules themselves only represent generalisations about ancient practice, which, as already noted, often varied widely⁵⁹.

In accord with the general extension in the use of the indicative in late Latin, Valla uses the indicative with *licet*⁶⁰. Although Valla employs *dum* with its normal meanings, he also frequently follows the late and

⁵⁵ For example: "Ad haec Q. Marcius respondit, si quid ab senatu petere *vellent*, ab armis *discedant*, Romam supplices *proficiscantur* ..." (*Cat.*, 34.1).

⁵⁶ See M. Andrewes, "The Function of Tense Variation" (note 54), 144-5.

⁵⁷ Valla's use of moods is not even always consistent with his own precepts. For example, Valla rebukes Poggio Bracciolini for using the present active subjunctive as an equivalent for an imperative ("dicas" in parallel construction with "recommenda"). See *Antidotum primum* (note 13), 3.272. Yet in the *Gesta*, Valla himself occasionally falls into the same habit, e.g. "istum ... metum ... deponite; nihilque aliud nisi de fortitudine ... cogitatis" (1.10.8), or "agite ... sequamini" (1.12.10).

⁵⁸ See M. Benner and E. Tengström, *On the Interpretation of Learned Neo-Latin*. *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* 39 (Göteborg, 1977), pp. 80-5.

⁵⁹ See the salutary remarks of Lebreton about the diversity of practice which can be found even in Cicero, in *Études* (note 47), p. 277.

⁶⁰ E.g. 3.12.5; 3.15.6. It should be noted that this construction is common in the late Roman jurists, a group of writers generally admired by Valla. In fact, Valla explicitly sanctions the use of *licet* with the indicative or subjunctive in the *Elegantiae* (2.21, p. 58). Valla's practice in the *Gesta* is in full accord with this, since he uses *licet* with the subjunctive as well as the indicative. See, for example, 1.5.4, 1.8.6, 1.11.11, 2.2.3, 2.3.14.

medieval Latin practice of treating *dum* as a synonym for *cum* in temporal clauses, e.g. “hora diei tertia, dum iam cibum iussi cepissent milites, Ferdinandus his verbis est adhortatus ...” (1.17.2)⁶¹. A very unusual phrase is “paucis diebus dum hec gesta sunt ...” (3.3.5), where *dum* seems to be almost the equivalent of *postquam* with a historic perfect. *Ubi* introducing a temporal clause is often employed with the subjunctive, even when the clause does not express iterative action and is not in *oratio obliqua*, a usage which is very rare in classical Latin (LHS, p. 652), e.g., “... ubi totam illam noctem rex ... insomnem duxisset, cum illuxit ...” (2.5.8)⁶². Valla persistently uses *quia* rather than *quod* meaning “in that” or “the fact that” introducing an explanatory clause, e.g. “addebat non leves illis stimulos, quia in conspectu suorum et de eorumquoque salute ac libertate pugnabant” (1.6.9)⁶³. This use of *quia* appears in early Latin, but the extension of *quia* at the expense of *quod* in this and other constructions is typical of late Latin (LHS, pp. 572-4, 586). Therefore, the following expressions are worth noting: “ex eo ... quia” (1.4.1 and 2.5.14) instead of *ex eo quod*; “cum eo ... quia” (3.3.9) for *cum eo quod* meaning “with the circumstance that”⁶⁴; *non quia* with the subjunctive instead of *non quod* to introduce a rejected reason (1.7.4; 2.16.12)⁶⁵; *non est quia* (1.8.6) instead of *non est quod* meaning “there is no reason for”⁶⁶; “huc accedebat quia” instead of *quod* (2.7.9); “praeterquam quia” (1.12.14) for *praeterquam quod*; *mirari quia* (1.2.16; 3.2.4) instead of *mirari quod*. Though *quia* is sometimes employed in these

⁶¹ For some other examples, see 1.10.2, 1.12.8, 1.16.7, 1.19.12, 2.3.9, 3.2.1, 3.5.5. For examples in the *Gesta* of the “classical” use of *dum*, meaning “while” or “until”, see 2.6.3, 2.9.2 (p. 115.12), 2.9.13, 2.12.5, 2.16.2, 2.16.9, 3.1.7, 3.2.6, 3.4.5. Note especially 2.3.9, p. 92.9-10, where *dum* meaning “until” is closely followed by *dum* equivalent to *cum*. *Dum* meaning *cum* is primarily a late Latin usage, with only a few examples in Silver Latin (TLL, 5.1; 2218.39-2219.11; 2229.20-2230.35). Instances of this use of *dum* in Livy cited by Riemann, *Études* (note 21), pp. 298-9, have been emended by modern editors. It is interesting that the Codex Agennensis of Livy (British Library, Harleianus 2493), which was heavily annotated by Valla, reads at 10.18.1, for example, “dum ea ... gererentur”, which is emended by Conway and Walters to “dum ... geruntur”.

⁶² See also 1.12.5, 1.14.12, 3.3.1, 3.8.4. Valla also uses *ubi* temporal with the indicative, see 1.4.2, 1.5.1, 1.9.1, 3.8.5.

⁶³ See also 1.3.2, 1.12.9, 1.19.17, 2.1.4, 2.3.17, 2.12.16, 2.12.20, 2.13.1, 2.13.4, 3.2.6, 3.4.3, 3.7.3, 3.13.2.

⁶⁴ For *cum eo ut* and *cum eo quod*, see Cicero, *Ad Atticum*, 6.1.7, and Livy, 30.10.20. See also the discussion of the phrase by Riemann, *Études* (note 21), p. 101.

⁶⁵ On *non quia* and *non quod*, see *Elegantiae*, 2.37, p. 69.

⁶⁶ Though we also find *non est quod*, see 1.1.3 (with a comma wrongly inserted after “est”), 1.17.7.

expressions in classical Latin, *quod* is preferred. Valla, on the other hand, clearly prefers *quia*, a habit which probably reflects the influence of late and medieval Latin. Noteworthy is *quia* meaning "why" and introducing an indirect question (2.13.6), since *quianam* is used for *quare* in early Latin, and *quia* for *quare* appears in late and medieval Latin (LHS, p. 584). Sometimes Valla employs *quia* meaning "that" as a virtual equivalent for the medieval *quod* or *quia* introducing an indirect statement⁶⁷. Also reminiscent of late and medieval Latin is "unde factum sit, quia ..." (1.2.2) with the subjunctive, where *quia* serves for *ut* consecutive. Note as well "hoc non perinde compertum est, ut pro vero queat affirmari" (3.13.8), where *perinde ... ut* has the force of *ita ... ut* with a consecutive clause⁶⁸.

Sometimes Valla's latinity shows traces of the analytical tendency typical of medieval Latin. He is capable of such phrases as "exercitus ex dimidio erat maior" (1.7.2), in which the preposition *ex* takes the place of the ablative of measure, or degree of difference, (TLL, 5.2; 1124.28-9). The connective "et nec" (1.16.8) is a typical late Latin pleonasm (LHS, p. 480). On occasion Valla employs circumlocutions with *magis* and *maxime* instead of the comparative and superlative, e.g., "magis indiligentem" (2.15.2), "maxime opportuna" (*ibid.*), "magis celebri" (3.4.7)⁶⁹, a common practice in late Latin (LHS, p. 165). Instances such as these are conspicuous because Valla's style, generally speaking, has a tendency to be elliptical, and even compressed.

It has been repeatedly observed that the medieval habit of ending the ablative of comparatives in -i persists into the age of humanism. Thus it is interesting to observe that throughout the *Gesta*, Valla uses both -e and -i for the ablative of the comparative. In the *Adnotationes in errores A. Raudensis*, Valla suggests that -e is the preferred ending for feminine comparatives and -i for the other genders⁷⁰. In the *Gesta*, however, -e and -i are used indiscriminately for all genders, e.g., "commodiore numero" (1.8.8), "maiori gloria" (1.12.10), etc. We also encounter in the

⁶⁷ E.g. "quia se absente per alium isti ad hoc ipsum adducerentur, non erat sperandum" (3.11.4); respondeo quia consiliarius" (3.12.1). *Quia* meaning "that" is found in early Latin, and in the vulgar portions of Petronius, but it is a growth in late Latin (LHS, p. 586).

⁶⁸ The only parallel for the latter expression which I have been able to find comes from late Latin: "nimius religionis Christianae insectator, perinde tamen ut cruore abstineret" (Eutropius, *Breviarium*, 10.16.3).

⁶⁹ The comparative of *celeber*, however, is not common (see TLL, 3; 737.78-80).

⁷⁰ See *Opera*, 1, p. 392.

Gesta at least one example of a late Latin shift of declension — *miliaribus* (1.7.4) for *miliariis* (i.e. *milliariis*). *Ficus* is treated as masculine (2.6.4), which has some rare parallels in ancient Latin (TLL, 6.1; 651.4-13)⁷¹. Valla employs *angustia* in the singular, e.g., “et nox et angustia loci” (2.14.4): this occurs once in Sallust and there are rare instances in Silver Latin, but this is primarily a late Latin feature (TLL, 2; 59.30-42).

As the *Elegantiae* and other works show, Valla was very concerned about the correct use of indefinite pronouns⁷². He is at pains to distinguish between *quidam* and *aliquis*. However, he considers *aliquis*, *quisquam*, *quispiam* and *ullus* to be virtually equivalent, although he recognises that *ullus* usually accompanies a negative (*Elegantiae*, 3.63). Yet in the *Gesta* we note “nec aliquod eorum” where *nec ullum* might be expected (3.12.7). Sentences such as “ego ... a sapientibus viris accepi ubi necesse est aliquid fieri aut, contra, ubi quid fieri possibile non est ...” (1.8.5) suggest that Valla may equate *quid* with *aliquid*⁷³. Though Valla uses the singular of *quisque*, he often employs it in the plural, usually linked with a superlative, e.g., “fidelissimosquosque” (1.8.4); “ignavissimis quibusque” (1.10.4); “obviosquosque” (2.14.3); “ut quosque honestissimos (sic) haberet” (3.3.7); “humillimosquosque” (3.12.3), a construction which is seldom found in classical Latin, but is the norm in late Latin (LHS, p. 170)⁷⁴.

One well-known characteristic of both medieval and humanistic Latin is the inconsistent use of the reflexives *se/suus* and the third person demonstratives *eius*, *is*, *ille*, etc. Modern studies frequently allude to this feature in contrast with “classical” usage, as though classical usage represents an invariable norm. Admittedly, the use of the reflexives and third person pronouns is not perhaps quite as haphazard in Caesar and Cicero as in certain late and medieval Latin texts, where *se* can often

⁷¹ On the declension of *ficus*, see *Elegantiae*, 1.4, pp. 6-7.

⁷² See *Elegantiae*, 3.16, pp. 91-2 and 3.63, p. 110: *Antidotum primum* (note 13), 1.104, 1.108, 3.67, 3.91, 3.118, etc.; *Laurentii Valle repastinatio dialectice et philosophiae*, ed. G. Zippel, vol. 1. *Thesaurus mundi* (Padova, 1982), 2.7.1-16.

⁷³ Compare Valla's statements in *Antidotum primum*, 3.67. *Quid* for *aliquid* is common in late Latin (LHS, p. 194).

⁷⁴ Cf. *Elegantiae*, 1.14, p. 19. But see also *Adnotationes in errores A. Raudensis, Opera*, 1, p. 412, where Valla implies disapproval of *quisque* used with the superlative plural. In general, *quisque* in the plural, with or without a superlative, is rare in classical prose. Exceptions occur where *quisque* refers to a substantive which has no singular, or when it refers to several groups rather than individual entities, or when it is linked to a neuter superlative. *Quisque* in the plural is somewhat less rare in the expression *ut quisque*. For a useful list of examples from a variety of authors, see Riemann, *Études* (note 21), pp. 182-5.

stand for *eum* in a simple uncompounded sentence. Nevertheless, the treatment of these pronouns can often be quite erratic in classical Latin too⁷⁵. Valla's own use of the reflexives is of special interest, since he completed in 1450 what seems to be the first systematic treatise on the subject entitled *De reciprocatione 'sui' et 'suus'*. This work shows that Valla was fully aware of how ambiguous and inconsistent the ancients could be in their employment of the reflexive pronoun and the reflexive possessive. Without formulating dogmatic rules, Valla attempts to lay down some guidelines for usage which are chiefly aimed at avoiding ambiguity⁷⁶. It will be of interest to consider, in the light of these guidelines, some examples of Valla's use of reflexives in the *Gesta Ferdinandi*.

We note the use of *suus*, meaning "his very own" to mark an emphatic opposition to another noun or pronoun which is *not* the subject: "ulterioribus autem beneficiis nos ita subito in *eum* uti, mores *sui* dissuadent" (3.5.17)⁷⁷. In *De reciprocatione*, Valla suggests that if the pronoun refers to the subject, one should use *suus*, but if it refers to the

⁷⁵ Compare, for example, "qui nunc populati atque vexati cuncti ad me publice saepe venerunt ut *suarum* fortunarum ... causam ... susciperem" (Cicero, *In Q. Caecilium*, 1.2) with "Pompeius idoneum locum nactus, ibi copias collocavit ... ignes ... fieri prohibuit, quo occultior esset *eius* adventus" (Caesar, *Bellum Civile*, 3.30) or "Milesios navem poposcit, quae *eum* ... Myndum prosequeretur" (Cicero, *Actio in Verrem* II, 1.34.86). For an extremely thorough account of the use of the reflexives in Cicero, see Lebreton, *Études* (note 47), pp. 111-49. See especially *ibid.*, pp. 130-1 for examples of the demonstrative instead of the reflexive which are difficult to explain. For the problem in general, see LHS, p. 175.

⁷⁶ Valla defines four causes why *sui* and *suus* are misused. One is the authority of Vergil, who employed these pronouns with poetic licence; second is the influence of corrupt passages in ancient texts; thirdly, the fact that the authors themselves often use the pronouns ambiguously; and fourthly, the use of *suus/se, is, ipse* sometimes seems to be indifferent. See *De reciprocatione*, chs. 5-8, *Opera* 1, pp. 239-41 (a critical edition of this work is badly needed). Valla also notes that erratic use of the pronouns in the scriptures is often due to translations from the Greek (*ibid.*, 9, pp. 242-3).

⁷⁷ Cf. "*Illum* ulciscuntur mores *sui*" (Cicero, *Ad Atticum*, 9.12.2). For other examples of this construction in Cicero, see Lebreton, *Études* (note 47), p. 134. It is also discussed by Valla, *De reciprocatione*, 14, p. 247. Similar passages in the *Gesta* are: "... nunc *regine sui* cives suaserunt" (3.6.7); "*Regem suum* in servitatem civium *suorum* redigi velle" (3.12.11) See also "... *eius* invocato nomine, feror in *suos* hostes" (1.13.7). However, I know of no exact parallel for the use of the ablative absolute in this sort of opposition. In the *Gesta* we also observe several passages where *suus* in an ablative absolute (about which Valla says nothing in *De reciprocatione*) refers not to the ablative subject, but to the subject of the main clause, e.g., "*Iuvenis* quidam ... Granate ... servitutum servivit, utente domino *sua* opera ..." (1.15.4); "Facto ... profectionis *sue* papa certiore ... <rex> mare ascendit" (3.10.4).

object, *eius* is preferable⁷⁸. Valla admits that this latter precept is sometimes violated, even by Cicero⁷⁹. But if a verb or adjective is added to the object making reciprocation possible, then *suus* is used to refer back to the object⁸⁰. In general, Valla's practice in the *Gesta* accords with these precepts, though there are some exceptions, such as the following:

"Ea de re fecialem ... Barcelonam mittit ... qui universam urbem perequians passim, ut quosque honestissimos haberet obvios percontaretur, nunquid Ioannem Raimundum Cardone comitem nosset. Respondentibusque se nosse, oraret ... renuntiarent *homini*, *se* vocari ... ad singulare certamen" (3.3.7)

Nothing which Valla says in *De reciprocatione* would seem to justify the use of *se* here rather than *eum*⁸¹.

It should be kept in mind that *De reciprocatione* was written later than the *Gesta*, and Valla may not have fully formulated his theories about the reflexives by 1447⁸². It would be of great interest to discover how closely Valla followed the principles outlined in *De reciprocatione* in his later works, and it would also be illuminating to learn whether these principles were ever consistently followed in practice in the period after

⁷⁸ "... si substantivum pronominis 'sui' respicit ad suppositum, 'suus' utique dicendum; sin ad appositum, saepius 'eius' dici, sive 'ipsius', sive 'illius'. Ad suppositum: ut, 'Tuetur nos Deus propter suam clementiam', non 'propter eius' ... Ad oppositum: ut, 'amamus Deum propter bonitatem eius': 'Allocutus sum hominem ante domum eius' libentius dixerim quam 'suam' ..." (*De reciprocatione*, 8, p. 242).

⁷⁹ See, for example, Cicero, *Pro Sestio*, 13.30: "Exterminabit cives Romanos edicto consul a *suis* dis penatibus?" Valla (*De reciprocatione*, *ibid.*) cites *De republica* 6.9 (or *Somnium Scipionis*, 1): "... ego *illum* de suo regno, ille me de nostra republica percontatus est". Valla argues that in such cases *eius* is preferable, but acknowledges that *suus* is permissible: "'inveni turturem in nodo eius': 'expuli leonem ex antro eius': nec tamen ratio obstat, quin et 'suo' dicatur ..." (*ibid.*).

⁸⁰ "Nisi si quod addatur appposito adiectivum, verbumve ad quod fieri reciprocatio debeat: quod genus est: 'Inveni leonem iratum, ac saeviozem ob amissam praedam suam': 'Video columbam tristem in periculo pullorum suorum': 'Nosti illum minus suo, quam suorum casu perterritum': 'Sentio hominem ambulante per domum suam', non 'per domum eius': Item, 'Scio illum dolere fortunam suam' ..." (*ibid.*). For this observation, see also Lebreton, *Études* (note 47), pp. 117-18. Cf. *Gesta* 2.7.3: "... ut <*eum*> regem ipsa ... faciat contra *suas* et quidem maiores natu sorores ...".

⁸¹ See also "In patrimonio regali tuendo tenax, quod qui alienarent aiebat inimicos potius sibi parare, quam amicos, quia ex subditis illos quosdam *regulos* facerent, semper *solicitos* ac *suspicientes eorum* iura licentiamque iri deminutum" (3.15.12). Here *eorum* rather than *sua* is probably used to avoid the inference that the pronoun refers to the same subject as *sibi*.

⁸² There is in fact some evidence for this. See the introduction to *Antidotum in Facium* (note 2), pp. CXLV-CXLVI, CLI, CLIV.

Valla's lifetime. The question of the influence of *De reciprocatione* is important, since it does not provide a restoration of ancient usage, but an "improved" and regularized version of ancient usage.

Actually no one should be surprised to encounter traces of medieval Latin in Valla's writings. The persistence of medieval syntax into the late humanist period has often been noted, though no very detailed study of the matter seems to exist⁸³. The works of early humanists, such as Petrarch, Salutati and Poggio abound with medievalisms, and it can scarcely be doubted that detailed study would reveal similar features in the latinity of others of the same period⁸⁴. Valla was born in the early fifteenth century, and his education took place when humanism was still very new. Many of the features of late and medieval Latin which we note in the *Gesta* are probably the result of habits acquired at an early age. Thus, in spite of his phenomenal critical acumen, his wide reading, and his immense effort to recover what he conceived to be a purer idiom, we should expect that some of the habits which he must have acquired while young would persist, especially when we consider that virtually all the lexica, and tools of modern scholarship were totally absent in Valla's day. What would be highly illuminating would be a study of the latinity of all of Valla's works. Then we would know whether or not he developed as a writer, and if so, in what directions.

The *Gesta*, therefore, is something of a hybrid, since Valla incorpora-

⁸³ This is especially noticeable in academic Latin, where the Ciceronian movement had little influence, even as late as the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Grammar books imparted meagre information about ancient syntax. Thus the extent of "classicism" attained by a neo-Latin writer depended chiefly on his reading and assimilation of ancient texts. See M. Benner and E. Tengström, *On the Interpretation of Learned Neo-Latin* (note 58), *passim*. See also L. Olschki, *Geschichte der neusprachlichen wissenschaftlichen Literatur. Bd. 2. Bildung und Wissenschaft im Zeitalter der Renaissance in Italien* (Leipzig, 1922), pp. 64-111; F. Blatt, "Die letzte Phase der lateinischen Sprache", *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 40 (1975-6), 65-75; I. Kajanto, "Aspects of Spinoza's Latinity", *Arctos* 13 (1979), 49-83; J. IJsewijn, "Mittelalterliches Latein und Humanistenlatein", in *Die Rezeption der Antike. Zum Problem der Kontinuität zwischen Mittelalter und Renaissance*, ed. A. Buck. Wolfenbütteler Abhandlungen zur Renaissanceforschung, 1 (Hamburg, 1981), pp. 71-84; B. Löfstedt, "Zur Latinität von T. Mores Utopia", *Arctos* 17 (1983), pp. 23-30; S. Rizzo, "Il latino nell'Umanesimo", in *Letteratura italiana*, ed., A. Asor Rosa, vol. 5, *Le questioni* (Torino 1986), pp. 379-408, especially, pp. 381-8 and 395-400.

⁸⁴ Petrarch, in particular, has been closely studied from this point of view. See, for example, P. Hazard, "Étude sur la latinité de Pétrarque d'après le livre XXIV des *Epistolae familiares*", *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* (École française de Rome) 24 (1904), pp. 219-46; G. Martellotti, "Latinità del Petrarca", *Studi Petrarqueschi* 7 (1961), pp. 219-30.

tes elements of Latin syntax from many periods. This impression is confirmed by a consideration of the vocabulary of the work. Although a thorough analysis of Valla's vocabulary in the *Gesta* is not the purpose of the present study, some general observations about Valla's choice of words will be pertinent to our appreciation of his latinity. For Valla, Latin was the living language of the learned world. However much he wished to purify Latin syntax, and to restore ancient usage, he saw clearly that it was necessary for the language to adapt to historical circumstances. In the *Gesta*, addressing the problems faced by a historian writing about contemporary affairs in Latin, Valla strongly advocates the use of new words for new inventions, instead of the clumsy circumlocutions employed by other humanists, and he vehemently defends this position in the *Antidotum in Facium*⁸⁵. Semantic precision is an important element in Valla's notion of *elegantia*, and it is precisely for this reason that Valla opposes the inaccurate use of ancient terms for new concepts⁸⁶.

As we would expect, Valla freely uses words attested only in post-Augustan and later Latin. The following examples (and this is by no means an exhaustive list) will give some indication: *adaptari* (1.14.6); *adustio* (3.10.12); *affectator* (2.15.13); *athleticus* (3.8.3); *austeritas* (2.13.27); *calcitrosus* (2.12.16); *clericalis* (3.12.6); *color*, meaning "false pretext" or "excuse" (2.13.4, 2.13.11, 3.4.1); *concivis* (1.12.6, 3.13.4)⁸⁷; *confederati* (3.4.12); *convexitas* (2.6.5); *coronatio* (3.7.2); *exhortator* (3.11.9); *favorabiliter* (2.7.11); *fenestella* (1.16.3); *festinantia* (2.15.7); *festinato* (1.12.6); *indubitatus* (3.10.7); *innodare* (2.6.10); *instrumenta* = "documents" (3.13.3); *peculiariter* (*praef.* 5); *prerogativa* (3.7.4); *professus*, meaning "open" or "undisguised, as in "professa ... ambitio" (3.8.6); *salarium* (3.15.9); *schisma* (3.10.7; 3.12.6); *recreatio* (2.12.20)⁸⁸.

⁸⁵ "Quare quis non videt rebus novis esse accommodanda nova nomina, ut veteres, a quibus precepta habemus et exempla sumimus, factitarunt?" (*Gesta*, 1.14.7). See Appendix III of Besomi's edition of the *Gesta*, pp. 194-204 for a long excursus on this passage which was deleted in the autograph manuscript. See also O. Besomi, "Dai 'Gesta Ferdinandi regis Aragonum' del Valla al 'De orthographia' del Tortelli, *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 9 (1966), 75-121. See also *Antidotum in Facium* (note 2), 1.14.18-23 on *bombarda*, for "cannon", and *ibid.*, 2.4.32-50.

⁸⁶ See Regoliosi's introduction to *Antidotum in Facium* (note 2), pp. LV-LXV; M. Tavoni, *Latino* (note 7), pp. 160-2; and Marsh, "Grammar, Method and Polemic (note 4), pp. 98-103.

⁸⁷ On *concivis*, see *Elegantiae*, 4.83, p. 149.

⁸⁸ For the words from *peculiariter* to *recreatio*, see OLD. For *schisma*, see A. Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.* (Oxford, 1949), p. 367A.

Valla also uses medieval Latin words, for example: *legitimatio* (2.5.2, 2.5.4); *hydriala* for "holy-water basin" (3.15.9); *portio*, meaning "property" or "revenue" (2.15.3)⁸⁹.

We note that Valla's choice of words is not always free of anachronism, since he employs ancient terms for contemporary military operations⁹⁰. In the *Antidotum in Facium*, defending the use of *prophetare* (*Gesta*, 2.4.14), Valla advocates the use of words from ecclesiastical Latin for a Christian context, instead of attempting to find pagan equivalents⁹¹. Thus it is interesting to note his use of *templum* for a church (1.18.1, 2.11.4-5, 3.7.5), but *ecclesia* for the catholic church (3.8.2). Valla prefers, for the sake of clarity, to use the geographical terms of his own era rather than ancient place-names⁹². In addition, he borrows vernacular words for social or political institutions and magistracies, where adapting a classical term would merely distort his meaning. In such cases, he sometimes adds an explanatory phrase such as "prefectumque classiarium, quem vulgo admiratum vocant" (2.13.20), or "in domo regia, que dicitur illorum lingua hosterium" (2.15.1)⁹³.

There is another important factor which should be taken into account in our consideration of the language of this work; this is the genre to which it belongs. Valla, after all, is writing history, and it is especially the historians Sallust and Livy who introduce many of the features typical of Silver Age prose. We would expect Valla to be influenced by Livy, since Valla is famous for his textual work on this writer⁹⁴. He also

⁸⁹ Valla uses several compounds for which it is difficult to find an exact parallel, e.g., *dispectoratus* (2.5.10); *subdormitare* (2.5.9: but cf. F. Arnaldi, *Latinitatis italicæ medii ævi inde ab anno CDLXXVI usque ad annum MXXII lexicon imperfectum*. 1939-64. (Reprint, Torino, 1970), vol. 3-4, p. 198B, for *subdormire*); *subrequiro* (2.2.10).

⁹⁰ For a list of these, see Besomi's introduction, p. XXV. Note also "fecialem, quem araldum vocant" (3.3.7), where Valla equates an ancient word with a modern one.

⁹¹ *Antidotum in Facium* (note 2), 2.1.28-34; 2.3.32-42; 2.5.30-2. Guillaume Budé advocates a similar procedure, though his practice is not always consistent. See J. IJsewijn, "Le latin des humanistes français. Evolution et étude comparative". In *L'Humanisme français au début de la Renaissance. Colloque internationale de Tours (XIV^e stage)*. De Pétrarque à Descartes, 29 (Paris, 1973), p. 339.

⁹² Though he notes that in some cases modern and ancient usage coincide. See *Gesta*. 1.2.1-3.

⁹³ Valla defends this practice in the *Antidotum in Facium*, arguing against Fazio's view that a circumlocution would be more appropriate than a vernacular word. See *Antidotum in Facium* (note 2), 1.13.1, 2.2.21, 2.3.45-6, 2.4.11-14, 3.4.10-14, 3.5.1-2.

⁹⁴ For Valla's studies on Livy, see G. Billanovich and M. Ferraris, "Per la fortuna di Tito Livio nel Rinascimento italiano. Le 'Emendationes in T. Livium' del Valla e il Codex

wrote a commentary on Sallust, which has so far not been studied by modern scholars⁹⁵. Valla himself was well aware, as the *Elegantiae* shows, that history was a freer genre of prose which could sometimes occupy a middle ground between poetry and formal oratorical prose⁹⁶. It is therefore tempting to assign many of the characteristic features of Silver Age prose which appear in the *Gesta* to the influence of Sallust or Livy. In most cases this would be rash, since so many of the usages first introduced to prose by Sallust or, more usually, Livy become very common in the general tradition of prose in the post-Augustan period. There are, however, certain features, which, though they also appear in other authors, are either so typical of one or more of the historians, or used by them in such a characteristic fashion that we can suggest with some confidence that their presence in Valla's *Gesta* is due to the influence of Roman historiography.

The most obvious manifestation of this kinship with the Roman historians is Valla's borrowing or adaptation of certain phrases. The apparatus to Besomi's edition records many echoes of the historians. We may take the opportunity here to note a few others: "angustias discrimenque ... evadentibus" (1.7.9), which is probably an echo of *angustias evadere* in Livy (e.g., 21.32.13; 38.2.8); "insignis inter paucas calamitas" (2.9.14) which is reminiscent of the common Livian expression *insignis inter* (TLL, 7.1; 1907.20-22); "ad hec" (1.6.4, 1.16.8, 1.16.11, and *passim*), meaning "in addition", a phrase which is very frequent in Livy and Tacitus (TLL, 1; 507.47-57); "in preteritum" (1.7.10, 3.9.6), an uncommon expression which probably echoes "venia in praeteritum donavit" in Suetonius, *Domitian*, 9.3; the adverbial phrases *ex adverso* and *ex composito* (1.13.1, 1.14.12, 2.6.5, 2.8.19, 2.14.2), which are extremely common in Livy (TLL, 1; 868.29-869.11 and 3; 2134.1-10); "imperator signa canere iubet" (1.11.3) with no

Regius di Livio", *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 1 (1958), 245-64, and G. Billanovich, "Un altro Livio corretto dal Valla", *ibid.*, 264-75. M. Regoliosi, "Lorenzo Valla, Antonio Panormita, Giacomo Curlo e le emendazioni a Livio", *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 24 (1981), pp. 287-316, and *idem*, "Le congetture a Livio del Valla: metodo e problemi", in *Lorenzo Valla e l'umanesimo italiano. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi umanistici, Parma 18-19 ottobre 1984*, edd. O. Besomi and M. Regoliosi, *Medioevo e Umanesimo* 59 (Padova, 1986), pp. 51-7. See also M. Regoliosi's introduction to *Antidotum in Facium* (note 2), pp. LXVII-LXXVII. I have not seen G. Billanovich, *La tradizione del testo di Livio e le origini dell'umanesimo*, I.1 (Padova, 1981).

⁹⁵ See Regoliosi's introduction to *Antidotum in Facium* (note 2), p. LXXVII.

⁹⁶ See, for example, *Elegantiae*, 3.40, p. 112 and 5.42, p. 178; *Antidotum in Facium* (note 2), 1.15.13.

object of *iubere* expressed, a common phrase in Sallust and especially in Livy (TLL, 7.2; 577.74-6)⁹⁷, and variations on the common connective phrase in historians, *dum haec ... geruntur/aguntur*⁹⁸. The word *obmoliens* (1.15.8) occurs in the Latin literature of antiquity only in Livy and Curtius (TLL, 9.2; 118.53-9). In the passage "ambo autem cum maiori equitatus parte curabant in postremis" (1.7.8), *curo* means "take command" or "take charge". Before the fourth century A.D., *curo* is used with this meaning only by Sallust and Tacitus (TLL, 4; 1504.84-1505.9). Valla constantly employs *ita* at the beginning of a phrase with a meaning virtually equivalent to *itaque*, e.g. "Ita primas partes tribuunt philosophis" (*praef.* 1), "Ita rex ... et fratris et populorum animum ... pertimescebat" (1.3.4), etc. This habit is attested in several authors, including Cicero, but it is a noteworthy trait of Sallust⁹⁹. The use of *ceterum* to begin a sentence as a connective particle meaning "moreover", or with an adversative force almost equivalent to *sed* or *autem*, is typical of the historians, especially Sallust and Livy¹⁰⁰. This is also evident in the *Gesta*, e.g., "Ceterum horum quatuor ..." (1.3.1); "Ceterum si ... aliter Deo cordi sit" (2.3.1); "Ceterum rex ... nepoti suo studebat" (2.3.13); "Ceterum neque ... tribuo" (2.9.16), etc.

Like the Roman historians, Sallust and Tacitus in particular, Valla enhances the liveliness of his narrative with frequent use of the historic infinitive¹⁰¹. The following example will give some indication:

"Publice autem post defunctum sepultumque regem patefacta est magis apertis studiis ianua et, omisso iudiciorum ordine, pro se quisque impensius quotidie parare arma, clientes contrahere, concire cuiusque generis homines, suas partes augere, consultare cum suis, nec

⁹⁷ Note also "signa canere imperat" (1.16.6). For the use of *imperare* with the simple active infinitive of transitive verbs without an accusative in Caesar and Sallust, see LHS p. 356.

⁹⁸ For examples, see 1.6.1; 1.12.1; 2.12.18; 3.2.1; 3.3.5. This formula is especially common in Livy and Justin. See especially the discussion by J.-P. Chausserie-Laprée, *L'expression narrative chez les historiens latins, histoire d'un style* (Paris, 1969), pp. 101-6.

⁹⁹ See W. Kroll, "Die Sprache des Sallust", *Glotta* 15 (1927), p. 285. In the *Elegantiae* (2.54, p. 76), Valla recognises this use of *ita*.

¹⁰⁰ See LHS, p. 492, and Riemann, *Études* (note 21), pp. 241-2.

¹⁰¹ See now B. Hessen, *Der historische Infinitiv im Wandel der Darstellungstechnik Sallusts*. Studien zur klassischen Philologie 10 (Frankfurt, 1984). The best summary is probably LHS, pp. 367-8. Unlike Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus, Caesar shows little taste for the historic infinitive, and Suetonius, with one possible exception, avoids it entirely. See P. Sage, "Quelques aspects de l'expression narrative dans les XII Césars de Suétone", *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 57 (1979), 18-23.

domestica tantum, sed externa etiam auxilia accersere, donare, polliceri, nihil remittere ..." (2.7.1)¹⁰²

Another technique employed by the Roman historians in animated and dramatic passages is the rapid shift from one tense to another, especially from the historic present to the imperfect or perfect, and vice-versa¹⁰³. A very similar phenomenon is apparent throughout Valla's *Gesta Ferdinandi*. In some cases this may merely be the result of carelessness in the use of tenses, a well-known characteristic of medieval Latin. However, the precedent of ancient usage, and the obvious dramatic effect of some passages encourage the supposition that Valla's use of this device may be influenced by the precedent of Sallust and Livy in particular¹⁰⁴. Note, for example:

"... reversus ad pontem, prelium maiore manu suorum iam senescens ac languidum *redintegrat*; et cum omnis moles belli in pontem *contrahitur*, pons ipse *solvitur* multosque mortales maiori quidem cum metu quam cum noxa in mare *exposuit* ..." (2.14.8).

It seems highly probable that the abrupt shift from the historic present to the perfect is meant to emphasise the sudden termination of the action occasioned by the collapse of the bridge.

Another habit of Valla's which may reflect the influence of ancient historical prose is the use of *cum inversum* to highlight a sudden development or change in a dramatic sequence, for example: "Iamque inter deliberationem ac festinantiam, velut ex incendio, per gradus lymphate in viam se proiecerant, cum in mentem venit vicine triremis" (2.15.7)¹⁰⁵. A somewhat similar effect is achieved by the use of the indicative in the apodosis of hypothetical, or contrary-to-fact conditions

¹⁰² For some other examples, see 1.8.2, p. 36.7-11; 1.15.7, p. 67.11-16; 1.17.16, p. 74.27-8; 2.7.7, p. 107.3-5; 2.8.15, p. 113.27; 3.3.2, p. 150.15-16; 3.3.8, p. 152.5-8; 3.4.12, p. 155.16.

¹⁰³ Perhaps the best discussion of *variatio temporum* in the Roman historians is Chausserie-Laprée, *L'expression narrative* (note 98), pp. 383-411.

¹⁰⁴ Shifts of tense in narration occur very frequently in the *Gesta*. The following are a few representative examples: "conclamatur ... discurritur ... properat ... pervenerat ... ferunt ... occurrunt ... oritur ... reddebat" (2.14.3-4) "... vertuntur ... sustinere ... vertuntur miscenturque ... feriebant" (2.9.10-11); "potiuntur ... poterant ... capti sunt ... contulerunt" (2.14.9); "poterat ... convolat cernitque ... audit ... erat (an echo of a Livian phrase perhaps accounts for *erat*) ... recurrit ... inflavit" (3.4.7).

¹⁰⁵ For other examples, see also 1.9.12, p. 44.17-19; 1.14.11, p. 64.14-18; 1.14.12, p. 64.21-3; 2.2.1, p. 86.1-2; 2.5.8, p. 100.27-30; 2.14.4-5, p. 135.4-10 (punctuated as two sentences); 2.14.6, p. 135.13-14; 3.4.10, p. 155.2-6. *Cum inversum* is also used in at least one passage which lacks this dramatic force, see 1.12.11, p. 57.5-8.

to emphasise the certainty of a result, had not another event intruded to prevent its realisation. In such cases the apodosis comes first, followed by *nisi*, for example: "... adeo de nuptiis actum erat, nisi puella alium virum se quam Alfonsum accepturam pernegasset" (1.3.8)¹⁰⁶. In neither case, however, can we be certain that the Roman historians are the source, since both constructions occur elsewhere: *cum inversum* especially, though typical of narrative sequences in the historians, is used with great effect by Cicero and other authors¹⁰⁷.

The prose of Sallust and Livy is also distinguished from other genres by its system of *clausulae*. The existence of a prose rhythm peculiar to historians was a matter of scholarly debate for much of this century. In recent years, however, the application of statistical methods to the study of prose rhythm has produced results which seem to be fairly secure¹⁰⁸. Sallust, probably influenced by Greek models (chiefly Thucydides) uses *clausulae* which differ markedly from those favored by Cicero. Livy, in the third, fourth and fifth decades, employs a series of rhythms very similar to those of Sallust. Cicero's preferred rhythms include the double trochee $\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}$ (often preceded by $\text{—}\text{—}$), the double cretic $\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}$ (or sometimes a single final cretic preceded by a long syllable), the cretic-trochee $\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}$, and $\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}$ (the famous "esse videatur")¹⁰⁹. Sallust and Livy favor the *clausula heroa* $\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}$ (or hexameter ending), the choriamb $\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}$, the double spondee $\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}$, and the choriamb followed

¹⁰⁶ Cf. "... pene actum de salute obsessorum erat, nisi ... aquam derivasset" (1.9.6); "... infelici et ipsi eventu, nisi fortuna affuisset" (1.12.1).

¹⁰⁷ See LHS, pp. 328-9, 623. For *cum inversum* and *nisi* as narrative techniques in Roman historiography, see the very thorough analysis by Chausserie-Laprée, *L'expression narrative* (note 98), pp. 561-615.

¹⁰⁸ The basic work on Cicero's prose rhythm is Th. Zielinski, *Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden: Grundzüge einer oratorischen Rhythmik*. Philologus, Supplementband 9 (Leipzig, 1904). See also A. W. de Groot, *La prose métrique des anciens* (Paris, 1926) and A. Primmer, *Cicero Numerosus: Studien zum antiken Prosarhythmus*. Sitzungsberichte, Oesterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 257 (Wien, 1968). For the *clausulae* of historians, see R. Ullmann, "Les clauses dans les discours de Salluste, Tite-Live et Tacite", *Symbolae Osloenses* 3 (1925), 65-75. The statistical method of internal comparison was applied first in the field of medieval Latin by T. Janson, *Prose Rhythm in Medieval Latin from the 9th to the 13th Century*, Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, 20 (Stockholm, 1975). The same method has been used to study the rhythm of Roman historians by H. Aili, *The Prose Rhythm of Sallust and Livy*, Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, 24 (Stockholm, 1979).

¹⁰⁹ Aili, *Prose Rhythm* (note 108), pp. 51-68, includes a valuable statistical analysis of samples from Cicero's *Pro Murena* and *Pro Sulla*, and his results essentially confirm the findings of earlier studies of Cicero's rhythm.

by a trochee $\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}\text{—}$. The only pattern favored by Sallust and Livy as well as by Cicero is the double cretic.

The "historical" *clausulae* vanish after Livy. Velleius and Curtius Rufus are Ciceronian, and Tacitus apparently favors no system of *clausulae* at all¹¹⁰. During the Middle Ages, as is well known, prose rhythm was based on word-accent rather than the quantities of syllables. However, the spread of humanism in early fifteenth-century Italy gave rise to a growing awareness of the differences between medieval and classical Latin¹¹¹. Some of the ancient texts which were rediscovered at this time contained detailed discussions of prose rhythm¹¹², and a number of the humanists developed a sensitivity to the *clausulae* of ancient prose¹¹³. Valla was apparently among these: indeed while still a young man, Valla was praised for his attention to rhythm by Leonardo Bruni¹¹⁴.

The following analysis of the *Gesta Ferdinandi regis Aragonum*, which is based on the method of internal comparison as applied to prose rhythm by Janson and Aili, clearly confirms that Valla favors certain *clausulae*¹¹⁵. The sample consists of every sentence ending throughout the text which meets the criteria for analysis, and this amounts to a total of 1145 *clausulae*¹¹⁶. Sentence endings are excluded from the test if the

¹¹⁰ For the history of the "historical" *clausulae* after Livy, see Aili, *Prose Rhythm* (note 108), pp. 126-30.

¹¹¹ See Gudrun Lindholm, *Studien zum mittellateinischen Prosarhythmus. Seine Entwicklung und sein Abklingen in der Briefliteratur Italiens* (Stockholm, 1963). Lindholm's study does not employ the method of internal comparison. Moreover, Lindholm accepts the view of W. Meyer, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Rhythmik*, 2 (Berlin, 1905), pp. 236-86, who maintains that the important factor in medieval *cursus* is the number of syllables between the last two accents, while discounting the importance of the number of syllables in the final word. See the remarks of Janson, *Prose Rhythm* (note 108), pp. 11-12. Nevertheless, in general, Lindholm's conclusions are probably correct: the medieval *cursus* disappears from the letters written by humanists in the early fifteenth century, and it vanishes from papal letters by the end of the century.

¹¹² For example, Cicero's *De oratore* 3.182-3 and *Orator* 191-226. See also Quintilian 9.4.

¹¹³ See R. Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino* (Catania, 1896), reprinted in *Guariniana*, ed. M. Sancipriano (Torino, 1964), pp. 74-5. Sabbadini asserts that many humanists preached the doctrine of *numerus*, but very few actually practiced it. In fact, however, we lack detailed studies of quantitative *clausulae* in the works of Italian humanists. A partial exception is G. Puccioni, "Il *numerus* nel *Coniurationis commentarium* del Poliziano", *Maia* 23 (1971), 338-46.

¹¹⁴ Kluge, "Die neulateinische Kunstprosa", (note 8), pp. 44-5.

¹¹⁵ Valla's use of rhythm in this work, however, is not strongly pronounced, and in some passages it would not be apparent to a casual reader.

¹¹⁶ The short passage following the preface (p. 8, lines 22-8) is not included.

metrical quantity of any of the final six syllables is dubious (e.g. a short vowel within a word followed by a mute and a liquid), or when vowel collision requires elision¹¹⁷. Only *clausulae* at the ends of sentences are counted, since the location of minor pauses is too often the result of subjective editorial judgment¹¹⁸.

The method involves comparing the expected frequency with the observed frequency of a long or short syllable in each of the final six syllables of the sentence¹¹⁹. Thus we are considering thirty-two possible combinations. If the observed frequency for any one of these combinations is markedly greater than expected frequency, we may suspect that the author favors this cadence. The X^2 test is then applied to the entire sample to determine whether or not the possibilities which seem to be favored are due to chance. If the X^2 figure greatly exceeds the critical value, the chance of randomness is accordingly very small¹²⁰. The X^2 value for the present sample is 158.2, while the critical value for a chance of randomness of .05, based on thirty-two pairs (i.e. the observed and expected frequencies for each cadence), or twenty-six degrees of freedom, is only 38.9¹²¹.

The most favored *clausula* is the cretic and trochee $\text{--}\cup\text{--}\cup$. When preceded by a long syllable ($\text{--}\text{--}\cup\text{--}\cup$) the observed frequency (o) in our sample is 97, while the expected frequency (e) is only 63. When preceded by a short syllable ($\cup\text{--}\cup\text{--}\cup$), (o) is 72 and (e) is 41. The difference between the versions preceded by a long or short syllables is probably accounted for by the different expected frequencies for long and short

¹¹⁷ Aphaeresis, however, does not cause rejection. I have adhered to Aili's principles for excluding *clausulae* from a sample (see *Prose Rhythm* [note 108], pp. 45-9), with one exception: Aili does not count *clausulae* when syllables can be contracted (e.g. *vestigis*, *regiis*, etc.). Since the edition of the *Gesta* preserves Valla's orthography, I have assumed that Valla's spelling indicates how we should read such syllables. Also excluded from my sample are all *clausulae* containing adaptations of vernacular terms or place names, as well as those sentences which are clearly direct quotations from other works (such as the citation from Quintilian in *praef.* 12).

¹¹⁸ In the few cases where my proposed revisions of the punctuation in Besomi's edition (see Appendix) would affect the end of sentences, I have employed the revised sentence structure for my count of *clausulae*.

¹¹⁹ My tests suggest that none of Valla's favoured *clausulae* are longer than six syllables.

¹²⁰ In the interest of brevity, I have not given a detailed description of the method here. For a full account, see Aili, *Prose Rhythm* (note 108), pp. 32-45.

¹²¹ For a fuller explication of the meaning of these terms, see Aili, *Prose Rhythm* (note 108), p. 38, and the table in T. H. Wonnacott and R. J. Wonnacott, *Introductory Statistics* (New York, 1977³), p. 614.

syllables in the sixth position. For a long syllable in this position (e) is 102 and for a short syllable (o) is 67. Both values are reasonably close to (o) of 97 and 72 respectively. These figures may indicate a very slight preference for a short syllable in the sixth position, but we are probably safe in assuming this *clausula* is only five syllables long¹²². This cadence is strongly favored in Cicero's speeches, but it is not one of the "historical" *clausulae*¹²³.

Also clearly favored by Valla is the double trochee (— ∪ — ∪), another Ciceronian ending. When preceded by ∪ —, (o) = 57 and (e) = 41, and when preceded by — —, (o) = 73 and (e) = 62¹²⁴. This amounts to a slight partiality for ∪ — as the two preceding syllables, which matches the configuration of this *clausula* preferred by Cicero. In full accord with this Ciceronian tendency is the fact that Valla also favors — ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪ ("esse videatur"). For this cadence (which might be regarded as a "resolved" cretic and trochee), (o) = 37 and (e) = 23. Cicero favors a four-syllable final word for this rhythm, and so does Valla¹²⁵. Another favored rhythm in the *Gesta* is the double cretic. In the present sample, — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ has an (o) value of 55 and an (e) value of 39. This cadence happens to be one favored by both Cicero and the historians¹²⁶.

The only one of the "historical" *clausulae* clearly favored by Valla is the choriamb, and he only does so when it is preceded by — ∪, and nearly

¹²² The total of 169 instances of this most favored cadence account for 15% of all the *clausulae* in the sample. This may be compared to Cicero's most favored cadence which accounts for 24.7% of the *clausulae* in the two speeches tested by Aili (see, p. 65), and with Sallust's most favored rhythm which makes up 10.9% of the Sallustian *clausulae* analysed in the same study (p. 96).

¹²³ See *ibid.*, pp. 57-60; 65. In *Elegantiae* 2.20, p. 58, Valla discusses two variants in the first sentence of the prologue to *Ad Herennium*: "suppeditare possumus" and "possumus". He favors the latter because of mood, and also "sonus ipse utpote in cursu medio periodi convenientior est in possum <u> s quam in possumus". It will be noted that "possumus" will give the cretic and trochee. However, Valla's remark implies that this cadence does not belong in the *middle* of a sentence. Apparently — as our study suggests — he regards it as more suitable for the *end* of a period. It would be interesting to analyse Valla's cadences at minor pauses within sentences: however, I have refrained from doing so because of the uncertainty about where the minor pauses actually occur (see Appendix on Punctuation).

¹²⁴ When preceded by ∪ ∪, or — ∪, it is clearly not favored: (o) = 27, (e) = 27, and (o) = 34, (e) = 41 in each case respectively.

¹²⁵ For the typology of this *clausula* in Cicero, see Aili, *The Prose Rhythm*, pp. 60-2; 65. Our figures also indicate that Valla slightly favors ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪: (o) = 20 and (e) = 15. However, this probably only a side-effect of his liking for "esse videatur", since the only difference is the first short syllable.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 54; 65; 82; 97; 103. Valla also seems to have a very small preference for ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪, for which (o) = 29 and (e) = 25. Here again we probably have an example of "neighbor effect", in this case resulting from Valla's partiality for the double cretic.

always with a final word of three or four syllables. For this particular configuration (— — — — —), his partiality is strong: (o) = 44 and (e) = 22. This means, however, Valla does *not* favor the final choriamb in precisely the same configuration as Sallust and Livy, since they prefer a long syllable preceding the choriamb¹²⁷. It is possibly significant that — — — — — is a rhythm which Cicero may have slightly favored in a few of his early speeches¹²⁸.

Thus, in spite of the fact that Valla worked closely on Livy and Sallust, and although the *Gesta* is a historical work, Valla's prose rhythm is nevertheless essentially Ciceronian, with only the partial exception of the choriamb. It is noteworthy that Valla shows a marked aversion to the *clausula heroa* or hexameter ending (— — — — —). This is one of the "historical" *clausulae* (the historians prefer it with a four or five-syllable final word, which distinguishes it from the normal hexameter end in verse); it is avoided by Cicero¹²⁹. In this respect also, Valla follows Cicero, for in present sample from the *Gesta*, there are only eleven instances of the *clausula heroa*, although the expected frequency is 60. This preference accords with Valla's remarks elsewhere; he criticises both Bartolomeo Facio and Poggio Bracciolini for ending sentences with this cadence¹³⁰.

Having studied the rhythm of Valla's *Gesta*, it is interesting to note the fact that Poliziano's historical monograph entitled *Coniurationis commentarium*, written in the late fifteenth century, seems to combine Ciceronian and "historical" *clausulae*. In contrast to Valla, Poliziano apparently likes the *clausula heroa*¹³¹. Because of the paucity of studies of *clausulae* in humanistic Latin prose, no further conclusions can be drawn here. But the comparison between Valla's *Gesta* and Poliziano's monograph suggests that further inquiry into the history of prose rhythm in humanistic Latin historiography might yield very interesting results.

¹²⁷ Aili, *The Prose Rhythm*, pp. 81-2; 96-7; 103-4.

¹²⁸ See A. W. de Groot, *De numero oratorio latino commentatio* (Groningen, 1919), pp. 36-41, and also Aili, *The Prose Rhythm*, p. 66.

¹²⁹ Though in his theoretical treatises Cicero seems to sanction its use (*Orator*, 217). See also Aili, *Prose Rhythm* (note 108), pp. 63-4; 96.

¹³⁰ *Antidotum in Facium* (note 2), 2.4.50 and *Antidotum primum* (note 13), 3.15. Valla also rebukes Poggio for writing an entire hexameter in prose (*ibid.*, 1.40).

¹³¹ See Puccioni, "Il numerus" (note 113). It should be noted, though, that Puccioni's study only provides a simple count of cadences and does not employ statistical methods.

We have so far been preoccupied with the influence of earlier periods of latinity on Valla's *Gesta*. There are other features of the language of this work which deserve note, some of which probably reflect the personal idiosyncracies of the author. The *Gesta* was written very quickly: Valla claims to have composed it in only two months¹³². Traces of this haste can be detected throughout the text. Indeed, a number of careless mistakes were noted by Valla's antagonist Bartolomeo Facio. In *Gesta* 1.12.5, Valla writes "Tubicines autem, cum fremitus hostium ac tumultum ab altera parte misceri cepisset ...", and in the *Antidotum in Facium* (1.7.7-12), he admits that he should have written *tumultus*, defending himself by pointing out that small errors are unavoidable when writing swiftly, and by observing that even Cicero was not above such slips. In *Antidotum in Facium* 1.8.16-18, Valla also admits that the phrase "circiter ad tria milia" (*Gesta*, 1.12.2) is redundant¹³³. In several passages of the *Antidotum in Facium*, Valla's quotations from the *Gesta* include variants which appear to be improvement on the text. For example, at *Gesta*, 2.15.8, we read:

"Dignum profecto risu spectaculum, si cui ridere in tali casu vacaret et alienum periculum ... spectare voluptati foret. Mulieres, crinibus pene passis, nocturna tantum veste indute aut alteraquoque circumvolute ... et inter eas reginam ... quasi pro corona currentes ... divaricatasque ad femora irrumpere in mare ..."

In *Antidotum in Facium*, 3.9.28, this is quoted as one sentence, and instead of the nominatives with "mulieres" we find the accusatives "indutas" and "circumvolutas"¹³⁴.

Other anomalies, which were not noticed by Bartolomeo Facio, and are not quoted in the *Antidotum in Facium*, are probably also the result of hasty writing. Valla twice writes *ne*, where he seems to mean *nec*¹³⁵.

¹³² See *Antidotum in Facium* (note 13), 1.3.1.

¹³³ There are occasional instances of redundancy elsewhere, e.g., "hec simultatum certamina" (2.12.7); "obsidere atque oppugnare" (2.13.22), although Valla's general tendency is in the opposite direction towards elliptical phrasing. In the *Antidotum in Facium*, he alludes to other mistakes in the *Gesta* caused by hasty writing, which he later corrected (see Regoliosi's note to *Antidotum in Facium* 1.8.17). See also *Antidotum in Facium*, 1.9.8, where Valla maintains that "ceteris aliis" at *Gesta*, *pref.* 18, should read "certis". However, in the autograph manuscript (for the shelf mark, see note 5) the reading is clearly "ceteris" (see f. 5^v).

¹³⁴ See also *Antidotum in Facium*, 1.10.26 and 1.12.21 (cf., *Gesta*, 1.5.1); 2.6.9 (cf., *Gesta*, 3.13.1). See also Regoliosi's discussion in the introduction to *Antidotum in Facium*, pp. CLXXIX-CLXXXIII.

¹³⁵ "Ne id possit ..." (1.14.6); "Ne id ... predicabat" (3.10.11).

We read “Cuius conspectus siquid adhuc in oppidanis erat animi ad pugnandum cecidit” (1.18.3), where the sense calls for *conspectu*; “cum magistratum, qui soli primigenio regis indulgeatur, sibi indultus sit” (2.4.8), where *magistratus* in the nominative is obviously required; “Non respondenti atque, ut solebat, sed alto somno subdormitanti ...” (2.5.9), where *atque* is superfluous. We find “ut sociis ... revocare non possit” (2.9.3), where *socios* must be what Valla meant; “profestus diei” (2.11.4) for *dies*; “genu sinistri” (2.12.16) for *genus sinistri*; “cum pro sua, tum vero pro domine pudore” (2.15.6), where *sua* should be *suo*; “ut in quam quisque provinciam” (3.1.8), where we would expect *suam quisque provinciam*; “fugente” (3.7.5) for *fungente*; “non ita pro magno habitum” (3.13.8), where Valla probably intended to write *habendum*¹³⁶.

Traces of this hasty (or unrevised) writing appear in the structure of several sentences. At 1.7.3, we read “suptractus militibus cibus, non modo membris vires, sed etiam animo qui magis quam corpus pugnat, vis suptrahitur.” Valla may have started to write *cibus* as the subject of an active verb *suptrahit* with *vires* as the object, but then shifted construction in mid-thought, making the verb passive with *vis* as the subject. An alteration of construction while writing at speed seems to be the most likely explanation for the odd nominative absolute “suptractus militibus cibus” in the sentence as we have it. A similar phenomenon might explain “ille qui ... iam dediscere non posset alium quam papam agere” (3.10.10). In the context — describing a pope who refuses to abdicate — the sentence is nonsense. However, Valla probably began to write something like “dediscere non posset papam agere”, but he modified his thoughts while writing, and never revised the sentence¹³⁷. It is more difficult to account for “siquidem in consilia de communi re consulturi et in templa oraturi arma portare vitio non datur” (3.4.9).

¹³⁶ The last sentence of 3.12.3 begins “Certa Lacedemonii — “which results in an anacoluthon. However, this is an error in the edition. The autograph manuscript (see note 5) reads “Certe” (f. 106^v). Thus “Lacedemonii” is the subject of “voluerunt”. We may note here a few other mistakes which result from the edition, and not from Valla. At 1.12.2 the edition has “perterre fecerat” which should read “perterrefecerat” (f. 29^v). At 2.9.11 “manus non conseruerant” should read “conseruerant” (f. 71^v); at 2.3.23 “etiam siquis minus vellent” should read “etiam siqui” (f. 58^v). Besomi’s apparatus tells us that the ‘s’ has been added. In fact, it has been erased (though with poor success). At 3.10.11 “se deligendorum iudicium principem” should read “iudicum” (f. 104^v). What looks like three minims with a *titulus* following the ‘c’ is actually two minims with a third vertical line from a tail on the back of ‘p’ beginning the next word. I have noted some other errors elsewhere in this study. There are also several obvious misprints, which I have not mentioned.

¹³⁷ I am grateful to Professor D. F. S. Thomson for the suggestion that a change in thought pattern might explain these irregularities.

The genitives "consulturi" and "oraturi" instead of datives with "vitio non datur" are surprising. Yet the construction, harsh though it is, makes sense, so perhaps we may assume it is deliberate.

Oddities which result from speed must be distinguished from those which result from a tendency towards elliptical expression which can be observed throughout the *Gesta*¹³⁸. To a moderate extent Valla seems to favor compressed locution, and this inclination can be paralleled in the works of other humanist historians¹³⁹. One obvious result of this is the omission of prepositions. We have already noted "proxima petra fluvius ... erumpens" (1.9.3) and "incidemus perturbationem" (1.14.7)¹⁴⁰: similar examples are "illi <e> porta ... egressi" (1.9.5) and "aut <ab> aliquo ... dictum est" (3.13.8)¹⁴¹. Pronouns, usually objects, are frequently omitted, for example: "intelligens res Aragonie ... non recte <se> habituras" (1.19.2); "ita ... legati ... <eum> deduxerunt" (2.12.4); "ignominia <alios> afficiunt" (3.3.10); "cum melius <se> haberet" (3.9.8); "Vos <me> adegistis" (3.12.12); "<mihi> iurandum" (*ibid.*); "<me> promittere cogitis" (*ibid.*). Auxiliary verbs are constantly omitted, especially with the future active infinitive, e.g., "... barbarus rex dicitur ... non modo se obsessos liberaturum <esse>

¹³⁸ This is perhaps less evident in the preface and in the initial portion of Book I than in the main body of the work. Moreover, it should be stressed that the instances of attenuated phrasing discussed here only represent a tendency. On occasion, Valla's sentences can be copious, and even redundant, e.g. '... quod in primis opto et quo nihil mihi videre est longius' (1.19.12).

¹³⁹ Bartolomeo Platina, in his *Liber de vitis Christi et omnium pontificum* (1471-4) borrowed extensively from medieval works. O. Merisalo, "Platina et le *Liber Pontificalis*. Un humaniste devant un texte médiéval", *Arctos. Acta Philologica Fennica* 16 (1982), 73-97, shows how Platina revised his material to accord with a humanistic sense of Latin style. A persistent feature of these revisions is the attempt to enhance the compression and brevity of the narrative. The traditional view that *brevitas* is desirable for the writing of history (e.g. Cicero, *Brutus*, 262) was well known in the humanist period. For discussion of the views of the ancient authors, see A. D. Leeman, *Orationis ratio. The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians, and Philosophers*, vol. 1 (Amsterdam, 1963), pp. 175-82, 191, 331-3 and the notes to these pages in Vol. 2 for references. In Book Three of the *Antidotum in Facium*, Valla, replying to Facio's repeated criticism that the *Gesta* lacks brevity, argues that the historian should beware of excessive brevity (*Antidotum in Facium* [note 2], 3.11.2-8). But at no point does Valla question the validity of the ideal of *brevitas* itself.

¹⁴⁰ See above, notes 22, 23.

¹⁴¹ Valla, however, will sometimes add prepositions for the sake of clarity. See, for example, "preter ea que ex Balegerio ... iniuriose fecisset" (3.5.11), where the preposition is added to indicate the action was done while the subject (Comes Iacobus) was occupying Balaguer.

iactasse, sed etiam obsidentes oppressurum <esse>” (1.9.12)¹⁴². In the following sentence all verbs are omitted: “Execrantium numina punitor acerrimus; aleatores ut pestes exosus” (3.15.10). Verbal action is abstracted and condensed by frequent use of impersonal passives, such as “aliquandiu acerrime ... dimicatur” (2.9.9)¹⁴³. Also attributable to this partiality for compressed expression and attenuated use of verbs are several fairly striking instances of zeugma, for example “paratum et passos iniuriam et inferentes ulcisci” (2.12.6), where *ulcisci* first means “take revenge for”, and then “take vengeance upon”¹⁴⁴.

Sometimes other important words must be supplied from the context, for example: “dimittit ad certius explorandum quante copie, quo in loco castra positura aut quid actura <sint> et hec renunciare episcopo <iubet>” (1.11.3); “<hostes suadentes> ut se dederent” (1.14.13); “inter eos reges fere convenit <ut>, veluti <inter> conspiratos et <qui> inter se amant¹⁴⁵, regem Castelle vel destructum vel deminutum vellent” (1.19.9); “et qui non minora ornamenta nature ad facunde pronuntiandum quam Episcopus Conseranensis ... <habere> iudicatus est” (2.10.11); “tu vero ... feliciter, honeste, atque ipso rege regalius <te geris>” (3.2.9).

Closely allied to this tendency towards elliptical phrasing is Valla's extensive reliance on participles rather than subordinating conjunctions¹⁴⁶. He is very fond of the ablative absolute, which is sometimes

¹⁴² This is very frequent throughout. Note these examples just from Book One alone: “venturos <esse>” (1.5.2); “permissuram <esse>” (1.7.2); “adepturos <esse>” (1.8.3); “facturos <esse>” (1.8.7); “reversurum <esse>” (1.8.14); “factos <esse>” (1.11.1); “acceptus <est>” (1.11.11); “passuros <esse> ... abituros <esse> ... optemperatos <esse> ... relicturum <esse> ... concessum <esse>” (1.11.13); “habituros <esse>” (1.12.2); “dedituros <esse>” (1.12.4); “frustraturum <esse>” (1.13.7); “reversuros <esse> ... deserturos <esse>” (1.14.9); “oppressuros <esse> ... retenturos <esse>” (1.14.10); “iussique <sunt>” (1.14.13); “inditum <est>” (1.15.11); “equatus <est>” (1.16.5).

¹⁴³ For some other representative examples, see “nequando mittendum pro eo longius foret” (1.6.4); “in eam cladem ventum non esset” (2.9.18); “dum ita transactum esset” (3.2.1); “longo ordine succeditur” (3.4.4); “occupandum esse ... Et confitendum ... est” (3.4.12); “Impetratum ... est (3.5.12); “discessum est” (3.10.14); “male consultum sit” (3.11.9); “in hoc deventum est” (3.12.13); “Additumquoque est, non esse temptandum” (3.13.3), etc.

¹⁴⁴ For some other examples, see “preferrent” first with the accusative and dative, then with *quam* (2.1.5); “vidit” with the future infinitive, meaning “realise”, and with *ne quid*, meaning “took care that nothing” (2.1.6).

¹⁴⁵ The edition incorrectly reads “ament”. The autograph manuscript (note 5) has “amant” (f. 48^r).

¹⁴⁶ Thus we encounter such sentences as “Cui rex assurgens, dexteram porrexit eamque amplexatum exosculatumque ori suo admovit osculumque mutuam dedit” (3.2.7).

quite complex, and — unlike the practice of Caesar and Cicero — is typically placed after the main clause of the sentence¹⁴⁷. A clear indication of Valla's emphasis on participles is his use of the nominative of the present participle in ways which extend well beyond its restricted sense of uncompleted action contemporaneous with the main verb. Instead of a subordinating causal conjunction such as *cum*, *quod*, etc., the present participle nominative is often used with a strong connotation of causality, for example; "Sed oppidani tinctis veneno sagittis utentes (= "since they were using"), nostros ad usum veneni vicissim compulerunt" (1.5.6)¹⁴⁸. This, of course, can be paralleled in classical prose. Even more striking, however, is the way in which the present participle nominative sometimes does service for a temporal clause denoting time *prior* to the main verb (as equivalent to the perfect participle of deponents), for example: "Tandem oratione blanda amicam civitatem appellans (= "after he had called"), ac merita commemorans (= "after he had recounted") ... responsum accepit" (3.4.10)¹⁴⁹.

Valla is especially partial to elliptical expressions involving a comparative, to which he devotes a whole chapter in the *Elegantiae*¹⁵⁰. In the *Antidotum in Facium* (1.6.28), Valla quotes the first sentence of Cicero's *Brutus* as an example of this type of construction: "Cicero: 'Maiorem opinione omnium cepi dolorem', quasi maior sit dolor quam opinio et non potius quam ille dolor quem omnium opinio fert me habere: quod sermonis genus habet nescio quid plus latinitatis et elegantie"¹⁵¹. In the *Gesta*, therefore, it is not surprising to find such phrases as "multo exilior expectatione hominum" (1.7.2); "maiora multorum opinione fecisti" (1.8.6); "maiores ipsorum spe potentiam"

¹⁴⁷ Suetonius is probably more fond of participles than any other Roman historian (this has often been noted: see, for example, P. Sage, "Quelques aspects de l'expression narrative dans ... Suétone", [note 101], pp. 31-2). For Caesar, the ablative absolute typically functions as a connection with the previous thought. See H. Gotoff, "Towards a Practical Criticism of Caesar's Prose Style", *Illinois Classical Studies* 9 (1984), pp. 9-11 (and the bibliographical references *ad loc.*). For an extremely detailed study, see Chausserie-Laprée, *L'expression narrative* (note 98), pp. 61-99.

¹⁴⁸ For some other examples, see "malentes" (1.6.10); "vertentes" (1.13.8); "exaudientes ... cernentes" (1.14.13); "videntes" (1.15.9); "ponentes" (1.16.3); "sperans ... volens" (2.4.6).

¹⁴⁹ For some similar examples, see: "insilientes" (1.6.10); "coniectans" (1.12.12); "incurrens" (2.7.20); "imperans" (2.13.16). See also *Elegantiae*, 1.31, p. 39, where Valla cites examples of the present participle used this way, and he advises the writer to employ it with caution.

¹⁵⁰ *Elegantiae*, 1.19, pp. 25-6.

¹⁵¹ See *Elegantiae*, *ibid.*, for the same citation.

(1.8.7); "tardius opinione veniebat" (2.15.12); "asperiores opinione sua" (3.11.2).

At this point we may briefly note a feature in the *Gesta* which has nothing to do with ellipsis, but which seems to be another distinctive habit in Valla's writing. *Ex quo* is very often used to begin a sentence or a clause with a meaning roughly equivalent to *quare* or *quam ob rem*. In such instances, *ex quo* has no specific antecedent, but it refers in general to whatever situation has just been described, for example: "Deus ... et causa optima ... et apparatus belli et fides sociorum promittunt me tibi cum victoria reversurum. Ex quo te bono animo esse ... decet ..." (1.8.14)¹⁵².

Although Valla does not make excessive use of rhetorical embellishment, ornament is certainly not absent in the *Gesta*. He persistently employs asyndeton, e.g., "personis, temporibus, rebus" (*praef.* 10)¹⁵³. Sometimes this involves groups of words, e.g., "exequiis apparandis, consiliis habendis, rebus componendis" (1.5.5)¹⁵⁴. Asyndeton is very frequently combined with anaphora for greater intensity, e.g., "plus gravitatis, plus prudentie, plus ... sapientie" (*praef.* 11), or "dignum avo, dignum patre, dignum fratre, dignum etiam regno" (1.5.1)¹⁵⁵.

These devices are common in elevated medieval Latin prose, which relies heavily on parallelism in structure and sound¹⁵⁶. In Valla's *Gesta*, however, the effect of parallelism is considerably mitigated by frequent and studied variation of construction, *Variatio sermonis* in the *Gesta* typically involves two members which are logically parallel, but given different syntactical structure¹⁵⁷. We read, for example, "Impetratum

¹⁵² For other examples see 1.11.18, 1.19.4, 1.19.9, 2.4.4, 2.4.10, 2.6.7, 2.6.10, 2.13.6, 3.4.11, 3.12.7.

¹⁵³ The following examples are limited to Book One (though this figure is also frequent in the other books): *praef.* 13.15-16; 1.2.16, p. 18.17; 1.4.3, p. 23.4; 1.5.2, p. 25.23; 1.5.3, p. 26.9; 1.6.9, p. 31.22; 1.6.10, p. 31.29; 1.8.2, p. 36.8; 1.10.8, p. 47.22; 1.13.9, p. 61.11; 1.16.2, p. 68.19-20; 1.16.6, p. 69.20-1; 1.17.4, p. 72.8; 1.17.13, p. 74.7-8 and 10; 1.19.5, p. 78.26; 1.19.10, p. 80.15; 1.19.14, p. 81.24. Asyndeton is a hallmark of Sallust's style, but, through the influence of Sallust, it is also a feature of later historical prose (LHS, p. 829).

¹⁵⁴ See also (examples again restricted to Book One): 1.3.2, p. 19.10-11; 1.9.11, p. 44.11-12; 1.11.15, p. 52.14-15; 1.12.3, p. 54.19-20.

¹⁵⁵ See also *praef.* 11, p. 6.20; *praef.* 16, p. 8.8-9; *praef.* 15, p. 7.31-p. 8.2; 1.2.16, p. 18.20-1; 1.4.3, p. 23.6-7 and *passim*.

¹⁵⁶ See the excellent discussion by Janet Martin, "Classicism and Style in Latin Literature", in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, edd. R. L. Benson and G. Constable (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), pp. 541-3.

¹⁵⁷ Valla does not rival some of the audacious examples of *variatio* which can be found in Tacitus, the supreme master of *variatio sermonis* in Latin prose. This feature of Tacitus'

tamen est, ut nihil in vita membrorumque iacture pateretur" (3.5.12), where *in* with the ablative is paired with the genitive *membrorum*; or "simul ac Petrum Pontium viderunt, sive continuato quem instituerant cursu, sive ob eum ipsum ... magis moti ... virum insequuntur" (1.11.5), where the causal ablative is paired with the preposition *ob*; or "multum de aggeribus tertie fosse in ipsam deiectum, non propter machine commoditatem ... sed quo pedites procurrare ... possent" (1.16.5), with *variatio* between *propter* and a final clause with *quo*; or "libertatis mire ac nemini obnoxius erat" (2.10.6), in which the genitive of quality is linked with an adjective¹⁵⁸. Parallelism is also sometimes avoided by chiasmic word order¹⁵⁹.

Like many Latin writers of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, Valla is fond of play on the sound and meaning of words¹⁶⁰. He has a moderate partiality for alliteration, e.g., "assidue aliis super alios applicantibus" (1.11.6), and alliterative doublets, e.g., "vestigiiis vestigandis" (1.14.4)¹⁶¹. Valla seems to delight in *adnominatio*, especially the kind which involves play on different forms of words with the same root, or varieties of the same word with different endings (*polyptoton*): as a rather extravagant example we may cite "qui obsidebant obsessi <videbantur>, et qui obsidebantur obsidere, et qui expugnabantur, expugnatores suos expugnare" (1.17.14)¹⁶². This sort of word-play is

style has often been noted and discussed. See, in particular, R. H. Martin, "Variatio and the Development of Tacitus' Style", *Eranos* 51 (1953), 89-96.

¹⁵⁸ For some other good examples, see "non quia ... sed ut" (1.7.4); "presertim ut tum erant solibus incocta et adipibus ... nonnihil alimenti flame prebentibus" (1.11.18); "incolumes et cum laude" (1.13.6); "partim illius benivolentia, partim ut ..." (2.1.4); "non sola forme prestantia ... nec ... quia" (2.1.6); "viventi patri ... sit iocunditati, et defuncto succedat" (2.3.1); "non modo ob odia partium ... sed etiam quia studeret" (2.4.4); "sive ob ... sive quia" (2.4.15); "tum propter ... tum quia" (3.1.3); "tum ... commoti ... tum quia" (3.5.9); "se iudicii maturandi ducem, se ut iudices ita sentiret ... effectorem" (3.10.11).

¹⁵⁹ See, for example: "ubi necesse est aliquid fieri aut, contra, ubi quid fieri possibile non est" (1.8.5); "auctoritas dignitatis quam animi prudentia" (3.5.2); "innocentie tue civitatis ac tuorum salutis" (3.12.9).

¹⁶⁰ For remarks in general on the fondness for alliteration and *adnominatio* among neo-Latin writers, see Kluge, "Die neulateinische Kunstprosa" (note 8), pp. 47-53.

¹⁶¹ For some other examples, see "fundit fugatque" (1.7.8); "perpetuam pacem" (2.2.11); "fortissime ac felicissime" (2.7.11); "promiscui pecoris" (2.8.11); "fremere ac furere" (2.8.15); "consilia coquebat" (3.1.3). Sallust is especially fond of alliterative pairs. For a useful list of such word groups in his works, see E. Skard, "Zur sprachlichen Entwicklung des Sallust", *Symbolae Osloenses* 39 (1964), 29-33.

¹⁶² For some other examples, see "obsidemus ... obsidet ... expugnet ... expugnetur" (1.8.5); "cunsilium non fuit aut fiducia defuit" (1.8.11); "defossus ac defodiens ... et cum effodit cuniculos, ipse cuniculus factus" (1.9.10); "obsessos ... obsidemus" (1.10.4); "alibi

frequently combined with antithesis, e.g., "... ut appareat ex homine ... excellenti formari potius precepta sapientie, quam ex preceptis sapientie formari hominem excellentem" (2.10.5)¹⁶³.

Valla's historical prose does not avoid personification and metaphor, and in the *Gesta* we find such passages as "Natabat omne humano cruore pavementum et gemitu morientium templum mugiebat" (1.18.2)¹⁶⁴; "patefacta est magis apertis studiis ianua" (2.7.1); "regie potestatis fulgor" (2.12.7); "qui tenui hereditarii regni apud feminam filo velut ancora navem spei sue firmabat" (2.13.9)¹⁶⁵. Not dissimilar is Valla's habit of employing an abstract or inanimate entity as a subject of a verb denoting human action, for example "altera <biremis> ... se cum socia missas dicit" (1.6.1) and "festinantia plures undique convenire non siverat" (2.7.17)¹⁶⁶. Valla sometimes employs abstract substantives in a rather unclassical fashion, e.g., "ardentem attentionem" (2.11.10) for *ardentes et attentos*; "hispanam circuncisionem" (1.5.1) denotes the non-Christian inhabitants of Spain. Concerning this latter passage, Valla, in the *Antidotum in Facium* (1.10.26-8), declares "multum ad brevitatem dicendi facit". The statement is just, and the employment of such expressions is another example of the tendency towards compression which we have already noted.

We can now summarise the results of our discussion. Valla's latinity

effusa, alibi confusa fuga" (1.11.9 and 2.15.8); "pro predatore ... preda" (1.12.6); "lateant ... latere ... fallant ... fallit" (1.14.11); "magis adhortando quam adhortante" (2.7.2); "non imbecilior ... propugnator, quam ceteri oppugnatores" (3.2.17); "provocantis ... provocare" (3.3.10); "si male consultum sit in principem consilii" (3.11.9); iurare, immo peierare" (3.12.12). See also 3.2.4, p. 147.1-2; 3.2.9, p. 148.15; 3.10.3, p. 169.15-17; 3.12.13, p. 179.16-17.

¹⁶³ For other examples, see 2.2.9, p. 88.4-5; 2.2.12, p. 88.30-3; 2.16.11, p. 142.17-18; 2.6.12, p. 142.25-6; 3.2.15, p. 149.25-7; 3.15.14, p. 187.3-5.

¹⁶⁴ The words are inspired by Statius, *Thebaid*, 6.28 (See Besomi's note *ad loc.*). See Valla's defence of this metaphor in *Antidotum in Facium* (note 2), 1.15.63-5.

¹⁶⁵ Note, in the last example, the partial apology for the metaphor with "velut". For other examples, see "predam e faucibus lupi" (2.15.4); "Quantum ... certaminis ... inter multos canes ac vetulam vulpem" (3.10.7); "pre umbra illius nominis" (3.10.10, with Valla's defence of this passage in *Antidotum in Facium*, 2.6.1-4); "verborumque procellas" (3.12.10, an echo of Quintilian, 8.6.48, as the editor notes); "Illi navem hanc (i.e. the "ship of state") ... moderati sunt" (3.12.13). Note also "mare ascendit" (3.10.4) and "mare descendit" (3.10.10) for *in navem ascendit*.

¹⁶⁶ See also "nostre <naves> ... discunt" (1.6.3); "due liburnice ... conspiciantur" (1.6.5); "Quod ubi rescivere Catalonie urbes ... dissuaserunt" (2.7.3); "Nec cuiusquam auctoritas ... ire obviam poterat" (2.7.7).

in the *Gesta Ferdinandi regis* owes much to the prose of the Silver Age. Valla's debt to the Roman historians, especially Livy and Sallust, is manifest throughout the work in the use of specific words, expressions, and in syntax, though not in rhythm. However, Valla's latinity is not "classical" — even if we understand this term in a loose sense to include Silver Latin as well as the prose of Caesar and Cicero — and we have many traces of late and medieval Latin in the *Gesta*. Valla's liking for elliptical expression, the balance between parallelism and studied disharmony in his sentences produce a result which is not an imitation of any single ancient writer, but which seems to be quite distinctive in its own right. We will be in a much better position to appreciate this when we have more studies of humanistic prose.

The *Gesta* did not have a wide diffusion, so we are probably safe in supposing that discussions of Valla's style by Italian humanists at the end of the fifteenth century refer to other works by Valla. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that Valla's latinity was not regarded with unanimous favor in late fifteenth-century Italy. Marcus Antonius Sabellicus, in his *De reparatione linguae latinae dialogus*, praises Valla as a scholar, translator and Latin stylist. But he notes the existence of those who consider Valla's style "rather rough"¹⁶⁷. In Paolo Cortesi's *De hominibus doctis* (1489), Valla's greatness as a scholar of the Latin language is contrasted with the inadequacy of his style¹⁶⁸. It is difficult to say how representative these views are. However, we can observe with some certainty that by 1500, although there were different views on style, Ciceronianism was coming to be the dominant ideal in Italy¹⁶⁹.

¹⁶⁷ "... cognoscite quae proprio fonte manarunt: epistolas, orationes, dialogos, et alia pleraque, quae non ita omnibus vulgata sunt, an est eo homine quicquam purius? sunt qui in his quoque eum duriusculum existiment: sed eruditio illa, ni fallor, est". See *M. Cocci Sabellici opera omnia*, vol. 4, (Basileae, 1560), col. 328.

¹⁶⁸ "*Alexander*. Quid ergo est causae, si tam diligenter Valla de ratione verborum Latinorum scripserit, ipse non bene satis loqui Latine videatur? *Antonius*. Non est enim, Alexander, eadem ratio scribendi quam praeciendi. Conabatur Valla vim verborum exprimere, et quasi vias, sed eas non rectas tradebat ad structuram orationis, in quo tamen et inquinatam dicendi consuetudinem emendavit, et multum acuit iuventutem. Sed est certe alia scribendi ratio, quae a Valla aut praetermissa est aut ignorata. Florens enim ille et suavis et incorruptus Latinus sermo postulat sane conglutinationem et comprehensionem quandam verborum, quibus conficitur ipsa concinnitas et sonus". Paolo Cortesi, *De hominibus doctis dialogus*, ed. M. T. Graziosi (Roma, 1973), p. 36. (I have not been able to see the more recent edition of this work by G. Ferrau, [Palermo, 1979]).

¹⁶⁹ See especially John D'Amico, "The Progress of Renaissance Latin Prose: The Case of Apuleianism", *Renaissance Quarterly* 37.3 (1984), 351-92. D'Amico discusses three contending schools of thought; the eclectics, who advocated the creation of a composite style drawing on the entire ancient Latin tradition, the archaisers or "Apuleians", who

Philology had made considerable strides by 1500, and with it came better understanding of the usages of different periods¹⁷⁰. It seems probable that Valla's style, with its Silver Latin expressions, peppered generously here and there with leftovers of medieval syntax, would scarcely have been regarded with general favor in this environment. But the situation in northern Europe, where Ciceronianism never achieved such dominance, was different. Here Valla's reception seems to have been much more favorable¹⁷¹.

Yet all of this is quite vague, and based on opinions voiced by a few men of the time. We really know very little about humanist Latin prose. Therefore it seems fitting to conclude with questions rather than answers. How would Valla's *Gesta* look in the context of a detailed study of evolution of Neo-Latin historical writing between ca. 1450 and ca. 1520? How much did Ciceronianism affect Latin history writing in Italy, by comparison with other genres such as the letter, the dialogue, and the oration? If history was less influenced by Cicero than other forms of prose, we might assume Livy, Sallust and others would be the natural models for historiography. Was this the case? And if so, was there a development towards more accurate imitation of these models, or did historical style branch off in new directions?

APPENDIX

O. Besomi's edition of the *Gesta Ferdinandi regis Aragonum* preserves the orthography of the autograph manuscript, Paris, Bibliothèque

developed an esoteric taste for early Latin and the archaising authors of the late second century, and the strictly imitative Ciceronians. While Ciceronianism became the standard for stylish Latin in sixteenth-century Italy, canons of "classicism" remained very much looser in other parts of Europe and in scientific Latin. See Benner and Tengstrom, *On the Interpretation of Learned Neo-Latin* (note 58), pp. 5-9.

¹⁷⁰ The change in the language of Roman inscriptions between 1450 and 1527 provides as striking confirmation of this change. See I. Kajanto, "Notes on the Language in the Latin Epitaphs of Renaissance Rome", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 28 (1979), 167-86.

¹⁷¹ While still a youth, Erasmus wrote a paraphrase of the *Elegantiae*. See V. de Caprio, "Appunti sul classicismo delle 'Eleganze' di L. Valla", *Annali Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia (Istituto di filologia moderna, Università di Roma)* 1.2 (1981), 59-80. De Caprio's remarks, however, are largely restricted to the *Elegantiae*. For Valla's reception in northern Europe see also the following essays in *Lorenzo Valla e l'umanesimo italiano*, edd. O. Besomi and M. Regoliosi (note 94): A. Sottili, "Notizie sul 'Nachleben' di Valla tra umanesimo e riforma", pp. 329-64; M. Cortesi, "Scritti di Lorenzo Valla tra Veneto e Germania", pp. 365-98; C. Vecce, "Tradizioni Valliane tra Parigi e le Fiandre, dal Cusano ad Erasmo", pp. 399-408.

Nationale, Lat. 6174. However, the editor departs from Valla's punctuation wherever he has thought fit to do so¹. Two arguments may be advanced in favor of this policy. Firstly, the autograph is a rough draft which was hastily written, and it may be doubted that Valla paid much attention to punctuation when he wrote it. Secondly, punctuation in the Renaissance was unsystematic and inconsistent, thus it is the normal policy among editors to introduce modern punctuation².

In this appendix, however, it is argued that the punctuation of a number of passages in Besomi's edition misrepresents Valla's meaning, and in such cases Valla's own punctuation in the autograph often gives us the key to the right interpretation. It is true Valla's punctuation sometimes differs from modern practice: in particular we note that he often uses less punctuation than modern sensibility would expect. But close attention should be given to Valla's punctuation marks, since they usually accurately indicate the major units of thought³.

There are some passages where Valla's punctuation can be adopted intact, with no injury to modern sensibility, and with vast improvement to the sense of the Latin. Compare, for example:

"Qua in urbe omni eo tempore victum gratuitum imperatori legatisque prebitum, et cuncta non carius mercatos fuisse homines, quam prius consuerant. Minora sunt, quam ut in tantis rebus memoranda sint."
(3.10.14)

"Qua in urbe omni eo tempore victum gratuitum imperatori legatisque prebitum, et cuncta non carius mercatos fuisse homines, quam prius consuerant, minora sunt, quam ut in tantis rebus memoranda sint."
(f. 104^v)

In Valla's version the infinitives "prebitum" and "mercatos fuisse" are accounted for by the fact that both clauses are in apposition with "minora sunt". Note also the following passages. In every case, the sense of Valla's punctuation is self evident.

¹ See his introduction, pp. LXXXVII-LXXXVIII.

² See, for example, the pertinent remarks of J. IJsewijn, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* (Amsterdam, 1977), p. 225.

³ See the important article by F. J. Nichols, "Conventions of Punctuation in Renaissance Latin Poetry", in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Amstelodamensis. Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*, Amsterdam 19-24 August 1973, edd. P. Tuynman, G. C. Kuiper, E. Kessler (München, 1979), pp. 835-50. Nichols argues that modern editors normally do not take sufficient account of the punctuation of Neo-Latin poetry. I think this is also true of prose, although I do not perhaps wish to go as far as Nichols in advocating total restoration of the original punctuation.

"Crederes nihil eum magis studere, quam ut illis gratum facere posset, hanc ipsam observantiam pietatemque in regemquoque transtulerat" (1.3.5)

In Valla's version (f. 10^v) "Hanc" begins a new sentence.

"Quod, siquis morbus ... contigisset" (1.8.5)

There is no pause after "quod" in the manuscript (f. 20^r).

"Pro re comperta habes dolum versatum esse in turri subruenda, et pro comperto (sic) habeas licet neque aliter in reliquum tempus expectes, non iam in turri, sed in tuo capite". (1.8.6)

"Pro re comperta habes dolum versatum esse in turri subruenda? et pro comperta habeas licet. neque aliter in reliquum tempus expectes, non iam in turri, sed in tuo capite". (f. 20^r)

"... sit eventurum. Deque auguriis, ominibus, pronosticis habent libros diligentissime scriptos. Horum, ut dixi, magistri, que opinio usque ab Homero ... sibi fidem vendicavit ..." (1.14.2)

"... sit eventurum. deque auguriis, ominibus, pronosticis, habent libros diligentissime scriptos, horum, ut dixi, magistri. Que opinio usque ab Homero ... sibi fidem vendicavit ..." (f. 33^r)

"... Federico morte avi prope destituto et per etatem magis adhortando quam adhortante duce Gandie, non per se sed per alios auxilia rogante ..." (2.7.2)

"... federico morte avi prope destituto et per etatem magis adhortando quam adhortante, duce Gandie non per se sed per alios auxilia rogante ..." (f. 64^v)

"Nova ubique facies, insolitus tumultus ac clamor eodem tempore terrestre prelium tam angusto in loco gerebatur ac cedes fiebat mari, palude et interiecta inter hec terra ..." (2.7.2.)

...Nova ubique facies, insolitus tumultus ac clamor, eodem tempore terrestre prelium tam angusto in loco gerebatur ac cedes fiebat, mari, palude, etc." (f. 71^r)

"Qui sermones ab iis inter se habiti ... incompertum mihi est. Quia nec aliquisprehendit ..." (2.11.3)

There is no sentence break here in the manuscript (f. 73^v), but a comma after "est." Valla's long sentence ending with "steterint" is a single syntactical unit and it should be preserved.

"... extimescebat ne respueretur, neve factum suum non satis idoneo colore tegere posset. Quippe qui credi volebat velle insulam in officio tenere, donec ..." (2.13.11)

There should be no sentence break after "posset", only a comma — as Valla punctuates on f. 79^r.

“... aut, si habet eam < dignitatem >, prerogativa regii culminis opus sit ab alteroquoque accipere ...” (3.7.4)

Valla (f. 99v) places the comma not after “eam” but after “culminis” which makes much better sense, since “prerogativa” is the subject of “habet”.

There are other passages where one might legitimately modify Valla’s punctuation, usually by adding more punctuation; but Valla has nevertheless indicated the most important breaks which clarify the sense and sometimes help avoid ambiguity — and these breaks have been ignored by the editor.

Constituerat enim sicut per consensum populorum. Alfonso rege presidente, lata lex fuerat, nequis illegitimus in regno succederet; ita nunc se presidente, per populos presentes, quibus idem liceat quod superioribus, exceptionem unius optinere ...” (2.3.20)

It is important to note that Valla at f. 57^v does not place a full stop after “populorum” because “constituerat” begins a long sequence in *oratio obliqua*. The fact that we find “fuerat” in the indicative presents no difficulty, since, as already discussed, Valla habitually slips into the indicative in *oratio obliqua*, even in subordinate clauses which are an integral part of the indirect discourse. To enhance clarity, commas, which are not present in Valla’s writing, should be added after “enim”, “populorum”, and “fuerat”. But Valla has a comma after “succederet” and this should be retained in preference to the semi-colon of the edition.

“Cum et belli administratio et pacis consultatio presentiam suam desiderarent, maluit bellum sibi desumere, ubi non cum suis sed cum hoste res est consultationi, ubi minus periculi versabatur, vicarium preficere Alfonso filium”. (3.5.1)

Valla makes very little use of punctuation in this passage (f. 95^v); he indicates no pauses after “desumere”, “consultationi” or “versabatur”. These pauses are necessary and are rightly added in the edition. However, Valla does have a comma between “est” and “consultationi”, and this is a crucial break, since it immediately clarifies the fact that the dative “consultationi” is taken with the accusative object of “preficere”.

“amiciciam ... Ladislai caram ... sibi esse ... federationem vero adversus Ludovicum inire non esse sue equitatis. Filium illius competitorum suum fuisse, hostem eum nunquam, nunc sublata emulatione,

agnoscere se utrunque et amicum et propinquum. Quorum pater consobrine vir esset, filius ex consobrina eadem natus, promptioremque se esse ad amicitiam inter ambos reges conciliandam ..." (3.6.3)

At f. 98^r Valla has a comma after "propinquum" and a period after "natus". The next sentence begins with "promptioremque". Taking the relative clause beginning with "quorum" as part of the preceding sentence greatly clarifies Valla's meaning⁴.

"Quid — ni vos reges, non ego aut superiores rege estis — monstri profecto ac prodigii simile, regem civibus suis pendere vectig<a> lia?" (3.12.2)

There is nothing in the meaning or the manuscript (ff. 105^{2v}-106^r) to justify the parenthetical dashes. Valla places a clear full stop after "estis" and "vectigalia". In neither case does he use a question mark. These are two exclamations, the first of which has some of the force of a rhetorical question. As usual, Valla is sparing with punctuation: "non ego" should be enclosed with commas to improve clarity. A better version of this passage might appear as follows:

"Quidni⁵ vos reges, non ego, aut superiores rege estis! Monstri profecto ac prodigii simile, regem civibus suis pendere vectigalia!"⁶

In a number of passages the editor ignores question marks in the original, and this sometimes results in considerable loss of force.

"Dura inibatur ex omni parte ratio. Inquireret fontes, quos magnos viros esse suspicabatur; at ne Adelittum quidem potuerat ulcisci, reficeret turrin; at magnum dispendium et ut in fame magis ac magis invalescente, in dies militum contumacia proponebatur, rediret infecta re; at non aliorum culpa, sed ducis argueretur". (1.8.4)

"dura inibatur ex omni parte ratio. Inquireret fontes quos magnos viros esse suspicabatur? At ne Adelittum quidem potuerat ulcisci. Reficeret turrin? At magnum dispendium et ut in fame magis ac magis invalescente in dies, militum contumacia proponebatur. Rediret infecta re? At non aliorum culpa, sed ducis argueretur". (f. 19^v)

⁴ Within the relative clause Valla has a comma after "pater" as well as after "esset". The first of these seems to have no function, and it may be a mistake caused by hasty writing.

⁵ Possibly to be spelled "Quid ni", as elsewhere, but word separation in this instance is not obvious in the manuscript.

⁶ In the same section (3.12.2), the edition prints "Quo mihi rex, inquit" — which must be a misprint for "'Quo mihi', rex inquit". The manuscript is no help here, since quotation marks are not indicated.

The great improvement brought about by restoring Valla's punctuation is obvious. In addition to the question marks, note the comma placed after (rather than preceding) "in dies". Taking "in dies" with "invalescere" surely makes better sense in this context. As already noted, Valla uses a minimum of punctuation; thus the addition of commas after "sontes" and "dispendium et" might be a further improvement.

"Videtur quo nam modo promittere cogitis, ac iurare, immo peierare".
(3.12.12)

The manuscript (f. 108^r) has a question mark after "cogitis", with the following clause added like an afterthought. It has been observed that in renaissance Latin, the question mark does not always come at the end of the sentence, but often at the end of the most strongly interrogative clause⁷. Therefore, this should be punctuated as a question. The same is true of the long sentence at *praef.* 15, beginning "Postremo quanta est opus ..." and ending "... historici sunt antepoenendi". In the manuscript (f. 4^v) Valla's question mark comes at the first clause ending with "constantia". Thus, in a modern edition, a question mark should end the sentence at "antepoenendi".

The following are some additional suggestions for improving the punctuation of Besomi's edition.

"Desiderataque sunt, ut eorum confessione compertum est, ad triginta milia virorum quingentasque mulieres, quae ob contumeliam quae illi sexui fit, magis illis dolere quam totidem viri ex nostris. Nonnulli de castris episcopi, vix plures ex aliis, nec sane multi vulnerati" (1.11.16)

In the manuscript (f. 28^r), we observe that Valla ends the first sentence with "viri", while "Ex nostris" begins the next sentence — which is obviously the correct way to read this passage.

"... rem vobis honestam ... proponam, quam eligatis, licet si placuerit" (1.12.7)

Valla (f. 29^v) has no comma after "eligatis" because "licet" governs that subjunctive. The comma should come after "licet".

"Etenim si alius quam ego rex Aragonum creetur, inter quem ac regem Castelle, ut memoria patrum scimus accidisse, discordia ex qua bella oriuntur, incidat. An speramus occupatos nos duplici Marte ... victoriam reportaturos ..." (1.19.7)

⁷ See, F. J. Nichols, "Conventions of punctuation" (above, note 3), pp. 841-3. Nichols' discussion is restricted to poetry, but the same seems to be true of prose.

The sentence does not end with "incidat" in the manuscript (f. 48^r). Actually this is an anacoluthon, a shift of thought and structure in mid-sentence. The break after "incidat" should be marked with a dash and the sentence should continue without capitalising "an".

"Potest, et id in causa regis fuisse, non malitia sed simplicitas" (2.5.6).

There should be no comma after "potest". It is not there in the original (see f. 61^r). To fill out Valla's punctuation, "non malitia", the true parenthesis, should be set off with commas.

"Interea comes ... par propemodum sui favoris ac partium naufragium fecit. Valentie primum abalienatis a se Centelliis, deinde ... Villaragutis profligatis" (2.8.5).

There is no pause after "fecit" in the manuscript (f. 68^v), indicating that the following ablative absolute is part of the same sentence.

"Franciscus Aranda ... ita accommodatus ad domos principum, quibus diu prefuerat moderandas, ut nusquam ..." (2.10.5)

A comma should be added after "prefuerat" (f. 72^v)⁸.

"... amici excusabant morbum in quem incidisse: credibile erat, tum propter merorem frustrate spei, tum quia ..." (3.1.3)

There is no punctuation after "incidisse" in the manuscript (f. 87^r), which confirms that "credibile erat" is to be taken with "incidisse", greatly improving the sense and also accounting for the infinitive.

"... iam quadringentorum numerum ... expleverant. Cum interim res incredibilis ... contingit ..." (3.4.4).

At f. 93^r there is no sentence break, but a comma after "expleverant". This is a single sentence with *cum inversum*⁹.

"... pro nostro iure dictum sit ... ea ... conditione nos te regem accepisse, teque iureiurando interposito rata nobis hec fore, recepisce" (3.12.8)

The final comma is misleading (f. 107^r). The subject of "recepisce"

⁸ Some cases of missing commas seem to be misprints. See "... estus vigiliarum" (2.13.27), which should be separated by a comma like the rest of the genitives in the list (see f. 81^r).

⁹ But see 2.14.4-5, where *cum inversum* is punctuated in the manuscript as two sentences.

(which here means “pledged” or “promised”) is “teque” and “rata ... fore” depends on “recepisse”, not on “iureiurando”.

“Vos adegistis, an mihi integrum erat nolle iurare ac promittere, cui proponebatur conditio. Si regni possessionem vellem, iurandum pariter ac promittendum?” (3.12.12)

Valla punctuates (ff. 107^v-108^r) with a full stop after “adegistis” and a new sentence with “An”. Moreover, there is no period after “conditio”, but a comma. The clause “si ... promittendum” is in indirect discourse after a verb of speech or thought implied in “conditio”, and therefore Valla’s punctuation should be adopted. Valla, however, omits the question mark here, and this should be retained. Either the omission was an oversight by Valla writing swiftly, or he thought that “An” beginning the sentence was sufficient to make the interrogative force clear¹⁰.

“Iuravi, si recte servandum¹¹ est, si secus corrigendum”. (3.12.13)

In accord with Valla’s punctuation in the manuscript (f. 108^r), a full stop after “iuravi” and a comma after “secus”, should be adopted.

“... illud mirabile, quod non ab omnibus eque ac magnum est, ponderatur ...” (3.14.3)

There is no comma after “est” in the manuscript (f. 109^v).

Dept. of Classics
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

¹⁰ On the use of *an* for questions or with verbs indicating doubt, see *Elegantiae*, 2.17, pp. 55-7.

¹¹ I.e. “<iusiurandum> servandum est”.

C. J. CLASSEN

CICERO ORATOR INTER GERMANOS REDIVIVUS*

Wer die Nationalliteraturen Europas im Zeitalter des Humanismus und Barock verstehen und würdigen will, muß auch die neulateinischen Werke einbeziehen, und wer die neulateinische Literatur verstehen will, muß sich stets vor Augen halten, daß sie ausnahmslos aus der fruchtbaren Spannung zwischen Tradition und Neuerung erwachsen ist, zwischen Antike und Gegenwart — und Gegenwart heißt in diesem Fall wiederbelebte Antike ebenso wie volkssprachliche Literatur und schöpferische Leistung der Prosaiker und Dichter der eigenen Zeit. Wiederbelebung der Antike meint einen ganz neuartigen Umgang mit den griechischen und lateinischen Autoren, die für lange Zeit weitgehend hinter theologischen und philosophischen Spekulationen und Streitereien — um nicht zu sagen Haarspaltereien — zurückgetreten waren und deren Kenntnis vielfach höchstens durch Anthologien vermittelt wurde; Wiederbelebung der Antike meint nicht zuletzt neu erwachendes Interesse an den Schriften Ciceros, der auch im Mittelalter nie ganz vergessen war, dessen Werke aber teilweise neu entdeckt werden mußten, etwa der vollständige Text der Bücher *De oratore* oder die Reden. Die verschiedensten Geister wurden von diesen Schriften gepackt, die mit ihrem Reichtum und ihrer Vielfalt die mannigfachsten Reaktionen auslösten. Daraus ergibt sich die Notwendigkeit der Beschränkung für die hier vorzutragenden Darlegungen: Es soll das Augenmerk vor allem auf das Studium der Reden Ciceros gelenkt werden, und zwar im deutschsprachigen Raum, nachdem ich mich vor vielen Jahren mit den

* Nach einem Vortrag, der auf dem sechsten internationalen Kongreß für neulateinische Studien am 15.8.1985 in Wolfenbüttel gehalten wurde. Herrn J. IJsewijn bin ich zu herzlichem Dank dafür verpflichtet, daß er diesem Aufsatz, für den in den Kongreßakten kein Platz gefunden werden konnte, zur Veröffentlichung verholfen hat, der Gesellschaft der Freunde der Herzog August Bibliothek dafür, daß sie mir einen vierzehntägigen Aufenthalt in Wolfenbüttel ermöglichte, außerdem der Leitung der Bibliothek und des Forschungs- und Kulturprogramms und den Mitarbeitern für die mir gewährte Hilfe.

Cicerostudien in der Romania beschäftigt und gewisse Unterschiede des Interesses und entsprechend der Formen der Erläuterung der Reden beobachtet habe¹.

Zunächst ist ein Wort zur lokalen Begrenzung nicht zu vermeiden. So überflüssig, so abwegig es erscheinen mag, innerhalb der in einer, nämlich der lateinischen Sprache abgefaßten Literatur ausgerechnet nach Ländergrenzen oder nationalen Unterschieden zu gliedern, so wenig kann man darauf verzichten, weil gerade viele der neulateinischen Autoren aus dem deutschsprachigen Raum auf ihre Herkunft Wert legen — ich erinnere an J. Wimpfeling oder H. Bebel — während die Humanisten Italiens die Barbaren aus dem Norden zu verachten und verspotten geneigt sind. Mit Recht betont J. IJsewijn daher², daß es in jedem Einzelfall wichtig ist zu wissen, in welcher sozialen, religiösen, literarischen und sprachlichen Tradition der einzelne Autor oder Gelehrte groß geworden ist. Es geht hier nicht um Nationalismus oder kulturhistorischen Imperialismus, sondern um das Verständnis geistesgeschichtlicher Zusammenhänge und Unterschiede.

In der schon genannten Arbeit über die Cicerostudien in der Romania im fünfzehnten und sechzehnten Jahrhundert, die auch vor allem der Beschäftigung mit Ciceros Reden galt, habe ich meine Beobachtungen zu den einzelnen Ländern folgendermaßen zusammengefaßt: In Italien findet man "nach dem politisch-rhetorischen, dem schulmäßig-stilistischen, dem historisch-sprachlichen, dem antiquarischen und dem textkritischen Studium Ciceros" gegen Ende des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts den Beginn der "zweiten Welle eines engherzigen, sprachlich-stilistischen

¹ "Cicerostudien in der Romania im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert", in: G. Radke (ed.), *Cicero, ein Mensch seiner Zeit* (Berlin 1968), S. 198-245. Zur Beschäftigung mit Cicero im Mittelalter vgl. L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford 1983), S. 54-98 (speeches), 99-112 (rhetorical works), 112-135 (philosophical works), 135-142 (letters), mit Angabe weiterer Literatur; zur Ergänzung wichtig S. Rizzo, *Catalogo dei Codici della pro Cluentio Ciceroniana* (Genua 1983) (auch zu Petrarca); zu Petrarca und Poggio Bracciolini s. nur R. Sabbadini, *Storia e Critica di Testi Latini* (Padua 1971²), zur Entdeckung des vollständigen Textes von *De oratore* vgl. J. Stroux, *Handschriftliche Studien zu Cicero De Oratore* (Leipzig 1921).

² Vgl. J. IJsewijn, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* (Amsterdam 1977), S. 123, der auch eine wichtige Darstellung der Anfänge des Humanismus in den Niederlanden gegeben hat: J. IJ., "The Coming of Humanism to the Low Countries", in: H. A. Oberman et al. (edd.), *Itinerarium Italicum ...* (Leiden 1975), S. 193-367; ebda. 371-436 schildert sehr viel knapper L. W. Spitz, "The Course of German Humanism", ausführlicher zu einem Teilaspekt ders., *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists* (Cambridge Mass. 1963); zu *L'humanisme allemand (1480-1540)* auch der Bericht des XVIII^e Colloque international de Tours (München 1979).

Studiums der Reden Ciceros, die vor allem dadurch fruchtbar wirkt, daß sie zur Entfaltung der Muttersprache beiträgt" (S. 217). In Spanien wird "das Studium der Antike nirgendwo um seiner selbst willen betrieben, überall steht es unmittelbar im Dienst der Erziehung: des grammatischen Unterrichts, der sprachlichen Schulung und der rednerischen — und philosophischen — Ausbildung; die Erziehung aber steht im Dienst der Festigung und Ausbreitung des christlichen Glaubens" (S. 228). "In Frankreich bleibt in fast ungebrochener Tradition das Interesse an der Antike, speziell der antiken Rhetorik spürbar, das zeitweilig von einem kleinen Kreis königlicher Sekretäre (neben einigen Dichtern) stärker belebt wird; und bei ihnen, den königlichen Beamten und Diplomaten, den Parlamentariern und Juristen hält es sich, während die Universitäten abseits stehen, mit Ausnahme der *lecteurs royaux*. Es fehlt die Kontinuität und Stabilität, die der Universitätsunterricht schafft, es fehlt der Ansporn, der durch den Wettstreit mehrerer Akademien und kleiner Höfe (wie in Italien) garantiert ist; es fehlt auch die weltferne künstliche Übertreibung der 'Ciceronianer' Italiens. Vielmehr sind die Franzosen oft Einzelgänger, Autodidakten, unmittelbar an der Sache interessiert und ihr hingegeben, daher bemüht, die Texte selbst zu klären in dem Bestreben, deren Gehalt nutzbar zu machen, das juristische Wissen, die rhetorischen Erkenntnisse, die sprachlichen Möglichkeiten — im Hinblick auf die eigene Sprache wie auf das Lateinische. Und ausgenutzt werden diese neugewonnenen Schätze im Bereich der Politik und der forensischen Beredsamkeit, doch — da die Theologen Zurückhaltung üben — nicht wie in Spanien in der Predigt oder richtiger nur in der Predigt der Protestanten" (S. 241-242).

Wendet man sich nun dem Raum nördlich der Alpen und östlich und nördlich von Frankreich zu, ist es ratsam, sich, ehe man zu den Einzelheiten kommt, folgende grundsätzliche Unterschiede zu vergegenwärtigen:

- 1) Anders als in Italien erwacht das Interesse an der Antike erst eigentlich nach der Erfindung der Buchdruckerkunst; damit ist von vornherein die Möglichkeit der verhältnismäßig raschen und weiträumigen, zugleich preiswerten Verbreitung einzelner Schriften gegeben, während die Vermittlung durch Lehrende zurücktritt.
- 2) Anders als in Frankreich gibt es kein Zentrum geistigen Lebens, das Paris vergleichbar wäre.
- 3) Anders als in Spanien wenden sich viele Humanisten dieses Raumes von den Traditionen der katholischen Kirche ab.

Welche weiteren Eigenarten das Studium der Schriften Ciceros, beson-

ders der Reden, in dem angegebenen geographischen Bereich bestimmen, gilt es jetzt zu klären.

Die frühesten Bemühungen italienischer Humanisten nördlich der Alpen stifteten nicht Nutzen, sondern Schaden. Petrarca und später Poggio brachten nicht neue Ideen, sondern entführten Handschriften, bekanntlich auch Cicerohandschriften, nicht ohne sich über die törichten Deutschen lustig zu machen oder sie gar anzugreifen. Immerhin bot schon das Konzil von Konstanz vielen Deutschen Gelegenheit, die Überlegenheit der Beredsamkeit der humanistisch geschulten Italiener kennenzulernen, und dies gilt in noch höherem Maße vom Konzil von Basel. Gewiß zeigte Enea Silvio Piccolomini³ — der aus diesem Anlaß von 1432-1442 mit Unterbrechungen dort weilte und später in der Kanzlei des Kaisers tätig war — seine Verachtung für die ungebildeten Fürsten ebenso wie etwa für die in scholastische Disputationen verstrickte Universität in Wien⁴. Zugleich ist zu vermuten, daß sein Wirken und das Auftreten anderer Italiener nördlich der Alpen manchen Studenten veranlaßt haben dürfte, nach Süden zu gehen. Wenn die negativen Urteile der dortigen Humanisten über die Deutschen nicht aufhören wollen, so wird das auch auf die wachsende Zahl der studierenden Gäste aus dem Norden zurückzuführen sein; sie verdienen deswegen mehr Beachtung, als ihnen von der Forschung geschenkt wird, weil sie in der Regel zurückgekehrt und oft, auch ohne sich einen großen Namen zu machen, zu Hause für die Verbreitung der neuen Gedanken und

³ Zu ihm vgl. G. Voigt, *Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini ... I/III* (Berlin 1856-1863); sein Briefwechsel wurde herausgegeben von R. Wolkan, *Fontes Rerum Austriacarum* 2. Abt. 61; 62; 67; 68 (Wien 1909-1918); weitere Literatur bei J. IJsewijn loc. cit., S. 56-57; H. Rupprich, *Deutsche Literatur vom späten Mittelalter bis zum Barock I/II* (München 1970-1973) I, S. 778, in: H. de Boor, R. Newald (edd.), *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* IV.

⁴ S. *epist.* 27 (vol. 61, S. 80-84, bes. 82); zur Kritik an ungebildeten Fürsten vgl. z.B. *epist.* 144 an Wilhelm von Stein (vol. 61, S. 326-331, bes. 330). Klagen über mangelndes Interesse an den *Studia humanitatis* z.B. *epist.* 96 an den Grafen Galeazzo von Arco (vol. 61, S. 218-219) oder mangelnde Kenntnis der Rhetorik *epist.* 25 an Gregor Heimbürg (vol. 67, S. 79-81). Seine eigenen Anschauungen über die Notwendigkeit, die antiken Dichter, Redner und Historiker zu lesen, vertritt Enea Silvio immer wieder, z.B. *epist.* 99 an Herzog Sigismund von Österreich (vol. 61, S. 222-236) oder *epist.* 40 an König Ladislaus (vol. 67, S. 103-158), auch mit englischer Übersetzung und Einleitung herausgegeben von J. S. Nelson, Diss. phil. Washington 1940; andererseits bemüht sich Enea Silvio, eine Abschrift des Kommentars von A. Luscius zu einigen Cicero-Reden zu bekommen (*epist.* 62, vol. 61, S. 162). Zu Enea Silvio als Apostel des Humanismus in Deutschland s. G. Voigt loc. cit. II, S. 342-358 und ders., *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums I/II* (Berlin 1893), II, S. 277-283 u.ö.

Lehrmethoden wie für die wiederentdeckten Autoren eingetreten sein dürften⁵.

Auffällig groß ist die Zahl der Deutschen, die in Italien seit 1465 als Drucker dafür sorgen, daß die Texte der antiken Autoren leichter zugänglich werden. Wenngleich ihr Einfluß auf die Entwicklung in der Heimat, wo man die neue Kunst auch bald mit großem Eifer zu nutzen beginnt, schwer abzuschätzen ist, so dürften sie zum Wiedererwachen des Interesses am klassischen Altertum nicht weniger beigetragen haben als die allerdings nur kleine Schar der südländischen, vor allem italienischen Humanisten, die man als Sekretäre oder Hauslehrer (wie Arriginus) oder als Universitätslehrer nördlich der Alpen nachweisen kann⁶. Zu ihnen gehört etwa der Spanier Jacobus Publicius (Rufus), der 1466 in Erfurt, 1467 in Leipzig, 1469 in Krakau und 1470 in Basel auftritt⁷. Seine als Teil der *Oratoriae artis epitomata* ursprünglich in Venedig (1482) erschienene *Ars Tulliano more epistolandi* belegt dadurch, daß sie mehrfach mit ähnlichen Titeln (etwa *Ars conficiendi epistolas elegantissime Tulliano more ... redacta*) auch in Deventer und Leipzig gedruckt wird, das anhaltende und verbreitete Bedürfnis für ein solches Lehrbuch und zugleich — ebenso wie das Gesamtwerk — die Orientierung an Cicero, vor allem an dessen Briefen, als Vorbild und Maßstab. Derartige Lehrbücher, Phrasensammlungen und Beispielsammlungen — *Ora-*

⁵ Schon früh hat L. Bertalot auf die verschiedenartigsten Handschriften hingewiesen, die in Italien studierende oder wirkende Deutsche geschrieben und später in die Heimat gebracht haben: *Studien zum deutschen und italienischen Humanismus* I/II (Rom 1975), I, S. 83-161, auch 1-82, zuerst 1910 bzw. 1908; vgl. ergänzend die zahlreichen Untersuchungen von A. Sottili.

⁶ Zum Wirken italienischer Humanisten nördlich der Alpen s. etwa C. Bursian, *Geschichte der klassischen Philologie in Deutschland* I/II (München 1883), I, S. 91-97; G. Voigt, *Wiederbelebung* II, S. 277-294; zu Arriginus s. W. Wattenbach, "Peter Luder", *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 22 (1869), 35-69; Briefe an ihn und von ihm ebda. S. 90-95.

⁷ Vgl. G. Bauch, *Die Universität Erfurt im Zeitalter des Frühhumanismus* (Breslau 1904), S. 53-56; ders., *Geschichte des Leipziger Frühhumanismus* (Leipzig 1899), S. 5; ders., "Deutsche Scholaren in Krakau", in: *78. Jahresbericht der Schlesischen Gesellschaft für vaterländische Cultur* (1901), III 11; E. Bonjour, *Die Universität Basel von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart 1460-1960* (Basel 1960), S. 95 mit A. 14; s. ferner M. E. Cosenza, *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300-1800*, I/VI (Boston 1962-1967), IV, S. 2967; für die Ausgaben der *Ars ... epistolandi* vgl. L. Hain, *Repertorium Bibliographicum* I/II (Stuttgart 1826-1838), II 2, S. 174-175, Nr. 13545-13552 und W. A. Copinger, *Supplement to Hain's Repertorium Bibliographicum* I/II (London 1895-1902), II 2, S. 38-39, Nr. 4977-4985. Publicius war übrigens nicht Italiener, sondern Spanier, vgl. A. Sottili, *Giacomo Publicio, "Hispanus", e la diffusione dell'Umanesimo in Germania* (Barcelona 1985).

tiuncule elegantiores ex diversis Marci Ciceronis epistolis — erscheinen auch noch über das Ende des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts hinaus in großer Zahl bei den Verlegern im Norden, und ihre Häufigkeit in unseren Bibliotheken deutet auf eine weite Verbreitung⁸.

Neben den Einflüssen von außen ist mit der Aktivität heimischer Kräfte zu rechnen, zu denen etwa die Bewegung der Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben zu zählen ist, über deren Bedeutung für die Verbreitung des Humanismus sich die Forschung bislang nicht hat einigen können⁹. Sicher wandten sie sich gegen den nutzlosen Grammatikunterricht, das sinnlose Auswendiglernen des *Doctrinale*, und traten für eine frühe Autorenlektüre ein. Auch darüber, wann und wo sich Vorzeichen oder erste Anzeichen für das Erwachen oder die Verbreitung des Humanismus an den Universitäten im deutschsprachigen Raum zeigten, hat man gestritten, weil der Begriff Humanismus viel zu vage ist¹⁰. Genügt schon die Behandlung Donats neben der des *Doctrinale* Alexanders — oder zählt erst die Lektüre der Autoren? Und wie läßt sich eine Beschäftigung mit den Autoren, ein intensives Studium der Texte beweisen, die man jedenfalls nicht aus der gelegentlichen Erwähnung zahlreicher Namen in einer Aufzählung erschließen darf, wie sie sich etwa im *carmen satiricum* des Nicolaus von Bibra findet, in dem auch Tullius' Beredsamkeit als Maßstab erscheint¹¹?

Lenken wir unsere Blicke auf einige der schon genannten Universitäten: Erfurt, Leipzig, Basel — Krakau lasse ich zunächst aus, weil es nicht im deutschsprachigen Raum liegt; es wird noch zu erwähnen sein — und zugleich einige der bekanntesten Humanisten der ersten Stunde aus den Landen nördlich der Alpen: Peter Luder, Albrecht von Eyb, Rudolf Agricola, Jakob Wimpfeling, Konrad Celtis, Heinrich Bebel und Jakob Locher. Was haben sie gemeinsam, was trennt sie, welche Bedeutung messen sie Cicero und dessen Reden bei¹²?

⁸ Der *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 6 (Leipzig 1934), S. 599-600 verzeichnet drei Drucke der *Oratiuncule* aus Deventer (zwei verschiedene Sammlungen: 6880-6882); sie werden später wiederholt, z.B. Köln 1510; zu F. Nigr s.u. A. 51.

⁹ Vgl. R. R. Post, *The Modern Devotion* (Leiden 1968), und die sich daran anschließende Diskussion.

¹⁰ Vgl. G. Bauch, *Erfurt* (s.o.A. 7), S. 20-24; s. auch E. Kleineidam, *Universitas studii Erfordensis* I/II (Leipzig 1964-1969) II, S. 38-63.

¹¹ Th. Fischer (ed.), *Nicolai de Bibera Carmen satiricum*, Erfurter Denkmäler 2 (Halle 1870), S. 41 (Vs. 106).

¹² Jeder Überblick über die Anfänge des Humanismus in Deutschland lehrt, daß viele Vertreter hier nicht erwähnt werden, z.B. Georg Peuerbach, Johannes Müller Regiomontanus, Samuel Karoch und andere, vor allem spätere; denn die Hinwendung zur Antike führt

Die drei zuerst Genannten, Luder, von Eyb und Agricola mögen wesentliche Anregungen bei ihren Studien in der Heimat erhalten haben, Luder in Heidelberg, von Eyb in Erfurt und Agricola in Groningen, Erfurt und Löwen. Entscheidend war für sie, daß sie nach Italien gingen und dort führende Humanisten kennenlernten, Luder den älteren Guarino, den Ciceroherausgeber, von Eyb u.a. Barzizza, Vittorino da Feltre und Filelfo, Agricola wenigstens Ludovico Carbone, wiederum einen Ciceroherausgeber. Nach seiner Rückkehr wirkte Peter Luder in Heidelberg (1456-1460) und Erfurt und trug dazu bei, daß das dort offenbar schon vorher erwachte Interesse an den "studia humanitatis" stärker gepflegt und gefördert wurde¹³. In seiner Antrittsrede begründete Luder seine Forderung mit dem persönlichen Nutzen, den man aus der Lektüre von Dichtern, Rednern und Historikern ziehen kann, da sie die "vitia" zu entlarven und den "virtutes" treu zu bleiben helfen, indem sie dem Leser Beispiele vor Augen führen. Daneben nannte er den Ruhm, den man so mehren, das "decus patriae", das man so schaffen kann — eine irgendwie religiös orientierte Begründung gab er nicht, und das gilt auch für Luders Ausführungen über die Wirkung der Beredsamkeit und seinen Rat, die Lektüre der Redner nicht zu vernachlässigen. Nicht in diesem Zusammenhang, sondern um die Dichter zu loben, zitierte er ausführlich eine Passage aus Ciceros Rede für Archias (16), und am Schluß ließ er ein weiteres Zitat aus der dritten philippischen Rede folgen, das sich auf das Danksagen bezieht (4)¹⁴.

nicht notwendigerweise zur Beschäftigung mit den Werken Ciceros, jedenfalls nicht zu deren Kommentierung, wenn Cicero auch als Vorbild für den Prosastil weithin Anerkennung findet; Literatur zu den Genannten verzeichnet H. Rupprich loc. cit. (s. o. A. 3), S. 777-778; S. 779.

¹³ Vgl. W. Wattenbach, "Peter Luder", *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 22 (1869), 33-127 (mit der Heidelberger Antrittsrede vom 15.7.1456: S. 100-110, vgl. dazu jetzt W. Barner, "'Studia toto amplexenda Pectore'. Zu Peter Luders Programmrede vom Jahre 1456", in: *Respublica Guelpherbytana. Festschrift für Paul Raabe*, Chloe 6 (Amsterdam 1987), S. 227-251) und "Nachträgliches über Peter Luder" ebda. 27 (1875), 95-99; neuere Literatur bei H. Rupprich loc. cit. (s.o. A. 3), S. 779 und F. Baron, in: *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon* 5 (1985), S. 954-959. Luder wirkte auch in Leipzig und später in Wien, wo er 1470-1472 Vorlesungen u.a. über verschiedene Schriften Ciceros hielt, vgl. H. Rupprich loc. cit., 471, der zugleich auf eine "nach Ciceros Reden gearbeitete, in Padua geschriebene Rhetorik" Luders verweist, die erst 1498 gedruckt wurde, vgl. auch W. Wattenbach loc. cit. 1869, S. 76 und S. 85-86 und 1875, S. 97 und G. Bauch, *Leipziger Frühhumanismus* (s.o. A. 7), S. 4; S. 73. Nachträglich werde ich durch die Freundlichkeit des Verfassers aufmerksam auf E. Bockelmann, *Die Metrikvorlesung des Frühhumanisten Peter Luder* (Bamberg 1984).

¹⁴ Zur Antrittsrede (die Luder 1461 in Erfurt mit wenigen ortsbedingten Änderungen erneut vortrug) s. A. 13, zum Nutzen der Lektüre: S. 103-108, zum "decus patriae" und dem Zitat aus *pro Archia*: S. 108, zum Zitat aus *Philippica* III: S. 109; ergänzend ist auf

Im Gegensatz zum Wirken Peter Luders, dessen unsteter Lebenswandel ihn hinderte, etwas zu veröffentlichen, erlaubt Albrecht von Eybs Lehrbuch *Margarita poetica*, ein deutlicheres Bild zu zeichnen. Albrecht von Eyb war nach erstem Studium in Erfurt — wieder Erfurt (1436-1438 und 1443) — nach Pavia, Padua und Bologna gegangen. Während seines vieljährigen Aufenthaltes in Italien erwarb er nicht nur die juristische Bildung, die ihm seine spätere Tätigkeit als Rechtsberater und Diplomat ermöglichte, und wurde von Pius II. (Enea Silvio Piccolomini) zum päpstlichen Kämmerer ernannt, er sammelte zahlreiche Handschriften antiker Autoren — vierzig Jahre nachdem Poggio seine Abschriften aus Deutschland nach Italien geschickt hatte. 1459 verfaßte von Eyb die *Margarita poetica*, ein nicht genügend bekanntes und gewürdigtes Werk, das nach eigener Zielsetzung “artis rhetoricae praeceptiones, diversas clausularum variaciones ac plurimas tam oratorum quam poetarum ac historicorum auctoritates ... quae ad ornatam concinnam splendidam et resonantem orationem ac ad bene beateque vivendum admodum conducerent et expedirent” zusammenstellt: Redekunst und Lebensweise werden hier deutlicher als bei Peter Luder miteinander verknüpft, während das patriotische Element fehlt¹⁵. Die Zahl der genannten, zitierten und exzerpierten Autoren überrascht und beeindruckt; sie reicht von Plautus über Vitruv zu Macrobius und weiter zu italienischen Humanisten wie Petrarca und Leonardo Bruni. Während sich die “praecepta” oft auf Ciceros Theorie stützen und nicht selten Beispiele aus dessen Reden anführen, ergänzt durch eine reiche Sammlung von “clausulae” (Buch 1, Kap. 3), d.h. Sätzen und Formulierungen für die verschiedensten Gelegenheiten, vereinen die “auctoritates” (Buch 2) Beispiele, mit denen der Einzelne seinen Stil beim Verfassen von Briefen

Luders ersten Anschlag in Heidelberg (S. 99-100) und die Anschläge und Einladungen in Leipzig zu verweisen (S. 122; S. 121; S. 123). Wie man antike Autoren moralisch ausbeuten kann, zeigt ein Brief Luders an Johannes Ernesti (Hans Ernst), dazu W. Wattenbach 1869, S. 54. Auch das Begleitschreiben, mit dem Luder seine Lobrede auf Friedrich den Siegreichen von der Pfalz vom 11.2.1458 an den Kurfürsten schickte, entlehnt mehrere Gedanken und Formulierungen Ciceros Rede für Archias, vor allem den Hinweis darauf, daß der Ruhm der siegreichen Feldherren vom Lob dessen abhängt, der ihn feiert, vgl. K. Hartfelder, “Zur Gelehrten Geschichte Heidelbergs”, *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 45, N.F. 6 (1891), 142-144; zu einigen Cicero-Handschriften, die aufgrund von Luders Tätigkeit angeschafft oder abgeschrieben sein mögen, s. W. Wattenbach loc. cit. (s. A. 13) 1875, S. 96-97.

¹⁵ Das Zitat findet sich in der Widmungsepistel (praefatio) an Johannes, Bischof von Münster, der *Margarita poetica*, zuerst gedruckt Nürnberg 1472; vgl. zu den Ausgaben *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 8 (Stuttgart 1978), S. 177-186, 9529-9537 und 9538-9541; zu Albrecht von Eyb s. G. Klecha, in: *Verfasserlexikon* 1 (1978), S. 180-186.

oder Reden schmücken und bereichern kann. Sie sind zu nicht geringem Teil Ciceros Werken entnommen, vor allem den philosophischen, etwa ein Sechstel den Reden, die er jedoch nach eigenem Bekunden rasch exzerpierte, um mehr Zeit und Raum für Laktanz zu haben¹⁶. Hier interessiert der antike Autor offenkundig nicht um seiner selbst willen, und auch die von ihm behandelte Sache gewinnt ihren Wert vor allem aus der Möglichkeit, sie inhaltlich oder formal zu übertragen.

Der Dichter Peter Luder zitierte die Rede für Archias, um den vielfältigen Wert der Dichtung zu verdeutlichen, die Freude, die sie vermittelt, den Trost, den sie spendet. Der Jurist und Diplomat von Ey rückt allein den Nutzen der antiken Autoren und der Autorenlektüre in den Mittelpunkt, und nur die Einzelheit, die einzelne Phrase, der einzelne Gedanke, das einzelne Beispiel wird beachtet — aber nicht der Zusammenhang. Wieweit die *Margarita poetica* für die zahllosen späteren Sammlungen von Phrasen und Formeln beispielhaft geworden ist oder wieweit diese durch andere Vorbilder angeregt worden sind, kann hier nicht untersucht werden¹⁷. Jedenfalls läßt auch von Eybs Werk die Orientierung an den praktischen Bedürfnissen deutlich werden, auf die schon bei Luder hingewiesen worden ist; sie prägt die Beschäftigung mit den antiken Autoren in Deutschland in der ersten Phase weitgehend und dient ihr zugleich als Rechtfertigung gegen alle Angriffe.

Eine Unterordnung unter eine Zielsetzung, die auf die Anwendbarkeit in der Praxis gerichtet ist, findet sich entsprechend auch in Rudolf Agricolas Werk *De inventione dialectica*. Wenn ich den Friesen Agricola hier einbeziehe, glaube ich dazu berechtigt zu sein, weil er von den Italienern ebenso als Vertreter Germaniens angesehen wurde wie von Erasmus¹⁸. Mag er, bei Groningen geboren, dort seine erste Ausbildung

¹⁶ Beispiele aus Ciceros philosophischen Schriften f. 156^r-181^r (1472, = Straßburg 1503, f. 152^r-173^v), aus den rhetorischen f. 181^r-188^v (= 1503, f. 173^v-179^v), aus den Reden f. 188^v-193^r (= 1503, f. 179^v-183^v).

¹⁷ Noch weniger als die Grammatiken, Rhetoriken und Briefsteller scheinen die Vokabularien und Sammlungen von Synonyma und Phrasen erforscht zu sein (*Vocabularius*, *Vocabulista*, *Promptuarium vocabulorum*, *Thesaurus* ..., *Synonymorum Collectanea*, *Hortulus elegantiarum*, um nur einige Titel zu nennen). Die wichtigste Literatur zu den Vokabularien verzeichnet K. Grubmüller, *Vocabularius Ex quo* (München 1977), S. 387-391. S. jetzt auch die Aufsätze von E. Bremer (S. 164-178), B. Schnell (S. 179-192) und H.-J. Stahl (S. 193-221) in: R. Hildebrandt und U. Knoop, *Brüder-Grimm - Symposium zur historischen Wortforschung* (Berlin 1986).

¹⁸ Vgl. nur H. Barbarus in seinem Epigramm, abgedruckt z.B. in: Rodolphi Agricolae *Lucubrationes* ... (Köln 1539), f. 2^r, oder Erasmus in einem Brief an G. Budé (*epist.* 480; II S. 365 Allen). Literatur zu R. Agricola verzeichnen F. J. Worstbrock, in: *Verfasserlexikon* 1 (1978), S. 180-186, und M. D. Nikolaou, *Sprache als Welterschließung und Sprache als*

genossen und nach Studien in Erfurt — wieder Erfurt — in Löwen vor allem die Gesellschaft von französisch sprechenden Kommilitonen gesucht haben, er selbst scheut sich nicht etwa in einem Brief an Rudolf von Langen von “nostra Germania”¹⁹ zu sprechen. In Italien weilte er etwa von 1469-1479 und verkehrte dort gerade auch mit deutschen Freunden, etwa Dietrich und Johannes von Plienigen (Pleningen) und Johann von Dalberg, der 1482 Bischof von Worms wurde und, wie Agricola aus Italien zurückgekehrt, ihn bald darauf nach Heidelberg einlud²⁰, wo Agricola einige Monate lang Vorlesungen hielt. Vielleicht trieb Agricola schon als Student in Erfurt Cicero- und Quintilianlektüre; jedenfalls setzt er sie, wie sein Biograph Johannes von Plienigen bezeugt, in Ferrara²¹ fort, wo der alte Guarino fast ein Menschenalter gewirkt hatte und dann dessen Sohn Battista und Ludovico Carbone, der Ciceroherausgeber, tätig waren.

Kurz vor der Heimreise in den Norden begann Agricola sein berühmtes Werk *De inventione dialectica*, das er 1479 in Dillingen abschloß. Es verdient unsere besondere Aufmerksamkeit, weil es neben der in Ferrara zum Lob der Philosophie gehaltenen Rede und mehreren Briefen an Jakob Barbirian einen Einblick in Agricolas Verhältnis zur Antike und in seine Anschauungen über das Studium der Alten vermittelt, vor allem weil es den ältesten Kommentar aus dem deutschsprachigen Raum zu einer Rede Ciceros enthält; es sind die *scholia* zur Rede *pro* (sic) *lege*

Norm, Diss. phil. München 1983 (München 1984), bes. S. 237-239; K. M. Ilg, *Das topisch-dialektische System der Sprache: R. Agricola: De inventione dialectica, Liber I*, Diss. phil. München 1984 (s.l. 1984), S. 271-272.

¹⁹ *Lucubrationes* (s.o. A. 18), S. 178.

²⁰ Zu Dietrich von Plienigen s. Franziska Gräfin Adelman, in: *Ludwigsburger Geschichtsblätter* 28 (1976), 9-139 und dies., *Dietrich von Plienigen* (München 1981), auch zu Johannes von Plienigen (1976: S. 21-25, 1981: S. 12-15); die Biographie Agricolas findet sich in: *Serapeum* 10 (1849), 101-107; 113-115, vgl. auch 115-119; zu Johann von Dalberg s. K. Morneweg, *Johann von Dalberg* (Heidelberg 1887); L. Lenhart, in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 3 (1957), S. 488.

²¹ In: *Serapeum* 10 (1849), 102; F. Gräfin Adelman loc. cit. (s.o. A. 20, 1981), S. 17-20. Dort hielt Agricola die berühmte Rede zum Lob der Philosophie, abgedruckt in den *Lucubrationes* (s.o. A. 18), S. 144-159 und z.B. bei H. Rupprich, *Humanismus und Renaissance in den deutschen Städten und an den Universitäten* (Leipzig 1935), S. 164-183. Zu Guarino s. M. E. Cosenza, *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary ...* (s.o. A. 7), II S. 1694-1717, zu Battista Guarino ebda., S. 1718-1720 (auf einen ungedruckten Kommentar B. Guarinos zu Ciceros rhetorischen Schriften verweist C. Vasoli, “Dialettica e retorica in Rodolfo Agricola”, in: *Atti e Memorie dell' Acc. Toscana di scienze e lettere* 22, n.s. 8 (1957, Florenz 1958), S. 318 A. 1), zu Ludovico Carbone s. M. E. Cosenza loc. cit. I 863-866 (dessen Ausgabe der Ciceroreden erschien in Venedig 1471: s. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 6 (Leipzig 1934), S. 545 Nr. 6765).

Manilia, durch die vor allem das, was zur "dialectice", d.h. zur "inveniendi iudicandique ratio" zu gehören scheint, erklärt wird²². Diese Ergänzung des Titels lehrt, was Agricola mit "inventio dialectica" meint, die Kunst Argumente zu finden, aus ihnen Schlüsse zu ziehen und auf diese Weise überzeugend und sachgerecht zu reden: "erit ergo nobis hoc pacto definita dialectice ars probabiliter de qualibet re proposita disse- rendi prout cuiusque natura capax esse fidei poterit"²³. Im Bewußtsein des schlichten Sprachunterrichtes seiner eigenen Zeit — jedenfalls in Deutschland ("corrupta institutio loquendi") — und der Fruchtlosigkeit scholastischer Disputierkunst ("perplexae disputationum ambages vel ... aenigmata ... quae tot iam seculis nullum invenerunt Oedipodem, qui ea solveret, nec inventura sunt unquam")²⁴, die er rügt wie vor ihm Valla, ist er bemüht, die durch weitgespannte eigene Lektüre der antiken Autoren gewonnenen Kenntnisse nutzbar zu machen, um für alle Genera der Rede zuverlässige Grundlagen und wirkungsvolle Formen zu schaffen, also nicht allein für Lob- und Festreden oder anderes, oft leeres Geschwätz, sondern gerade für die Rede, insofern sie unverzichtbares Instrument aller Wissenschaft ist, ohne die weder Überlegungen vorge- tragen noch Ergebnisse vermittelt werden können. So wie mit der Grammatik vertraut sein muß, wer einzelne Sätze richtig bilden will, so muß in der Dialektik geübt sein, wer eine These vertreten, ein Urteil fällen, einen Beweis führen oder neue Erkenntnisse gewinnen will. Die Fähigkeit, die jeweils passenden Topoi ("loci") zu finden, sich ihrer entsprechend ihrem Wesen — er unterscheidet vierundzwanzig Typen — in verschiedenen Formen der Argumentation zu bedienen und das ganze Argumentationsgefüge wirkungsvoll zu disponieren — diese Fähigkeit, die "inventio dialectica", vermittelt Agricola mit Hilfe seiner Kenntnis

²² Erst die von Alardus Amstelredamus besorgte Ausgabe (Köln 1539) enthält diesen Kommentar (S. 461-471); die früheren Drucke verzeichnet G. C. Huisman, *Rudolph Agricola. A Bibliography of Printed Works and Translations* (Nieuwkoop 1985), S. 17-51.

²³ I, S. 193 (1539); in der Ausgabe Köln 1528 (Nachdruck Hildesheim 1976), S. 155 (ohne "fidei").

²⁴ *Lucubrationes* (s.o. A. 18), S. 194 in seinem bekanntesten Brief an Jakob Barbirian, verfaßt in Heidelberg am 7.6.1484 (zuerst gedruckt Antwerpen 1511, auch separat unter verschiedenen Titeln, etwa *Libellus de formando studio vere aureus* (Köln 1532), vgl. *Index Aureliensis* I A 1 (1965), S. 178-182). In seiner *Oratio de vita R. Agricolae* rühmt Philipp Melanchthon: "Cum Germania corruptissimo genere sermonis uteretur tantaque literarum inscitia esset, ut quid esset recte loqui ne quidem suspicari nostri homines possent, imo etiam insulitas admirationem haberet, unus Rodolphus primum auribus atque animo sentire illa vitia et desiderare meliorem orationi formam coepit" (C. G. Bretschneider (ed.), *Ph. Melanchthonis Opera* 11 (Halle 1843), S. 440). Agricola selbst schreibt zwar gutes Latein, schließt sich aber keineswegs eng an Cicero an, sondern folgt eher Quintilian.

der antiken Literatur. Schier unübersehbar erscheint die Zahl der Beispiele, die Agricola aus den verschiedensten Autoren heranzieht, um alle Einzelheiten zu illustrieren, Begriffe, "loci" und deren Anwendungsweisen.

Greift Agricola auch dafür gern auf die Reden Ciceros zurück, so dient ihm die Rede für die *lex Manilia* als Ganzes dazu, für die vorher systematisch erörterten Regeln Beispiele zu liefern. Einzelne Argumentationen werden auf ihre Grundform reduziert:

Wir müssen den Krieg führen, in dem es um das
Wohl der Bundesgenossen geht;
im mithridatischen Krieg geht es um das Wohl
der Bundesgenossen;
also müssen wir diesen Krieg führen.

Darauf folgt die Erklärung der Teile: "huius argumentationis medium est, salus sociorum, quod si conferatur cum hoc bello, spectabit ad locum causae finalis". Neben solche Analysen treten Zusammenfassungen, durch die das Auge des Lesers für die Lektüre geschärft wird: "apud Ciceronem fere semper minor propositio ponitur totius argumentationis, quod cum fit frequenter, probat maiorem, quam non explicavit"²⁵.

Dies ist, wie gesagt, der älteste (mir bekannte) Kommentar zu einer Rede Ciceros aus dem deutschsprachigen Raum — gedruckt allerdings erst sechzig Jahre später (1539) — aber ist es ein Kommentar?

Gewiß gibt Agricola einleitend eine Einführung in die Rede und läßt Sacherklärungen, historische Erläuterungen (unter Berufung auf Appian und Plutarch), Worterklärungen und stilistische Bemerkungen folgen²⁶. Doch dabei wird die Rede selbst zum Arsenal von Topoi und Schlußformen. Nicht das Verständnis der einzelnen Rede oder eine Würdigung der Beredsamkeit Ciceros sind hier beabsichtigt, sondern die Belehrung der Leser, denen Exempla zur Verwendung oder Nachahmung bereitgestellt werden. Ziel ist, das Werk des antiken Autors ganz unmittelbar für die Praxis nutzbar zu machen, wie denn Agricolas logische Bemühungen überhaupt von praktischen Interessen geprägt sind. Wie er diese Rede für die "inventio" nutzbar macht, so empfiehlt er in seinem berühmten Brief an Barbirian vom 7.6.1484 die Lektüre der Alten, weil sie Sachwissen vermitteln, weil sie zu angemessener Darstellung befähigen.

²⁵ *De inventione dialectica* (Köln 1539), S. 465 und S. 466.

²⁶ *De inventione dialectica* (Köln 1539), S. 461-464.

gen, also den Stil zu schulen helfen, vor allem wenn man deren Werke in die Muttersprache übersetzt, und schließlich weil die Historiker, Dichter und Redner durch Lob des Guten und Tadel des Bösen ethische Grundsätze vermitteln²⁷.

Agricolas Werk ist eine vielfältige Wirkung beschieden gewesen, obwohl es nicht vor 1515 im Druck erschien (in Löwen, der Kommentar sogar erst 1539) und wegen seiner Ausführlichkeit schwer zugänglich war, weswegen es mehrfach in *Epitomae* zusammengefaßt wurde, z.B. von B. Latomus, dem bekannten, eifrigen Ciceroerklärer (1530)²⁸. Wenn Agricola so erfolgreich war — und auch seine mündlich tradierte Lehre beeinflusste offenbar eine große Zahl von Schülern (in der Schule seines Freundes Alexander Hegius z.B. Johannes Murnellius oder Johannes Caesarius²⁹, in Heidelberg Jakob Wimpfeling und Konrad Celtis) — so gewiß deswegen, weil er auf planmäßigem, methodischen Vorgehen bestand, weil er etwas anbot, was für alle Disziplinen offenkundig grundlegend war, schließlich weil er zu eigener Aktivität aufforderte und sich die von ihm entwickelten Lehren als anwendbar und nützlich erwiesen.

Direkt unter seinem Einfluß dürften die Übersetzungen von Dietrich von Pleningen entstanden sein, mit dem Agricola seit den gemeinsam in Italien verbrachten Tagen befreundet war und mit dem er in Heidelberg zum Kreis um Johann von Dalberg gehörte. In der Tat war der kurfürstliche Rat entscheidend an der Einladung Agricolas nach Heidelberg beteiligt³⁰. Den allgemeinen Ratschlägen Agricolas folgend übersetzte Dietrich eine Reihe lateinischer und neulateinischer Autoren

²⁷ *Lucubrationes* (s.o. A. 18), S. 195; S. 196; S. 194 (in dem schon erwähnten Brief an J. Barbirian, (s.o. A. 24).

²⁸ Zu den Kurzfassungen von B. Latomus (1530 u.ö.), J. Visorius (1534 u.ö.), Ch. Rhodolphus (1538) und Alardus Amstelredamus (1538 u.ö.) s. W. J. Ong, *Ramus and Talon Inventory* (Cambridge Mass. 1958), S. 542-554; W. Risse, *Bibliographia logica I/II* (Hildesheim 1965-73) I, S. 279 (Index Commentatorum); zu B. Latomus s.u. A. 121.

²⁹ Literatur zu den drei Genannten zitiert H. Rupprich *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 3), S. 782-783, vgl. zu A. Hegius auch G. Theuerkauf, in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 8 (1969), S. 232-233; F. J. Worstbrock, "Zur Biographie des Alexander Hegius", *Hum. Lov.* 29 (1980), 161-165; zu A. Hegius und J. Murnellius auch P. N. M. Bot, *Humanisme en Onderwijs in Nederland*, Diss. phil. Nimwegen 1955 (Utrecht 1955), S. 30-33 u.ö. und S. 33-37 u.ö., zu Caesarius C. Vasoli, "Ricerche sulle 'Dialettiche' del Cinquecento", *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 20 (1965), 115-150, bes. S. 127-150. Daß Agricolas Werk "nimis subtilis" sei, beklagt J. Wimpfeling, vgl. O. Herding (ed.), *Jakob Wimpfeling's Adolescentia* (München 1965), S. 67-68.

³⁰ Vgl. F. Gräfin Adelman, *Dietrich von Pleningen* (München 1981), S. 37-38.

(und lateinische Versionen griechischer) ins Deutsche, darunter Sallusts Monographien, "darbey auch die durch ächtlich Oration, die Cicero wider Catilinam gehalten auch des Catilinen verantwortung". Es ist die erste Übersetzung einer Rede Ciceros ins Deutsche (zusammen mit zwei späten Fälschungen), begonnen vielleicht noch in den letzten Jahrzehnten des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts, aber erst 1513 abgeschlossen und 1515 in Landshut gedruckt³¹. Sie gibt Anlaß daran zu erinnern, daß Friedrich Riederer schon 1493 "eines der ersten deutschen gerichtlichen Formularbücher"³² in Freiburg veröffentlichte unter dem Titel "Spiegel der waren Rhetoric usz M. Tulio C. und andern getütscht mit Irn glidern cluger reden sandbriefen und formen menicher contract seltzam Regulierts Tütschs und nutzbar exempliert". Das Lehrbuch führt eine Fülle von Beispielen aus antiken Autoren an, auch aus Ciceros Reden, und stützt sich vor allem auf dessen rhetorische Schriften und Quintilian. Auf diese Weise sucht es das antike Erbe unmittelbar für die Praxis sogar in der Muttersprache zu erschließen.

Zu den jüngeren Zeitgenossen Agricolas zählt Wimpfeling, zu Agricolas Schülern Celtis, die hier beide folgen sollen, weil es nicht meine Absicht ist, nur eine lange Kette von Kommentatoren aufzureihen, sondern weil ich vielmehr aus der Fülle der Humanisten einige herausgreifen möchte, die in je eigener Weise dazu beigetragen haben, das Interesse an Ciceros Reden zu wecken, oder auch nicht.

Jakob Wimpfeling, in Schlettstadt geboren und gestorben (1450-1528), besuchte die dort blühende Schule³³. Ihr Leiter war der von den Brüdern des gemeinsamen Lebens geprägte Ludwig Dringenberg, dessen Verdienste um die Ausbreitung des Humanismus verschieden beurteilt worden sind³⁴. Jedenfalls ist nicht zu vergessen, daß überall im Lande das Unbehagen an den traditionellen Lehrmethoden und Lehrstoffen

³¹ Vgl. F. J. Worstbrock, *Deutsche Antikerezeption 1450-1550*, 1 (Boppard 1976), S. 128 (323), auch handschriftlich erhalten: S. 127-128 (321-322), dazu F. Gräfin Adelman *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 30), S. 76-77. Zu den früheren, also frühhumanistischen Übersetzern s. E. Bernstein, *Die Literatur des deutschen Frühhumanismus* (Stuttgart 1978), bes. S. 41-98.

³² I. Braun, in: *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 28 (1889), S. 529, vgl. L. Hain *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 7) II 2, S. 221, Nr. 13914. Die frühesten, selbständig erschienenen Übersetzungen ciceronischer Reden stammen von Christoph Bruno, s. F. J. Worstbrock *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 31), S. 48 (*Pro Marcello*); die philosophischen Schriften werden noch früher übersetzt (s. F. J. Worstbrock, S. 49-50), die rhetorischen in dieser Zeit noch nicht.

³³ Zu J. Wimpfeling vgl. J. Knepper, *Jakob Wimpfeling (1450-1528)*, (Freiburg 1902); neuere Literatur nennt H. Rupprich *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 3), S. 780-781.

³⁴ W. Wattenbach hat sein 1869 (S. 34. s.o. A. 13) gefälltes Urteil 1875 (S. 97-99) zurückgenommen, s. jetzt F. J. Worstbrock, in: *Verfasserlexikon* 2 (1980), S. 235-237.

wuchs, teilweise gefördert von Lehrern, die in Italien gewesen waren, und immer mehr Schüler immer früher zur Autorenlektüre geführt wurden, unabhängig von den offiziellen Lehrplänen und Schulordnungen³⁵. Will man sich ein einigermaßen vollständiges Bild von der Entwicklung an den Schulen und den Universitäten machen — die Grenzen zwischen beiden sind oft fließend — so muß man auch die Erinnerungen einzelner an ihre Schulzeit und die Schülergespräche mit ihren Hinweisen auf Mißstände und Neuerungen berücksichtigen³⁶, ferner die Zahl der Textausgaben und Anthologien aus antiken Autoren, die oft in rascher Folge Neuauflagen erlebten und offenbar viel benutzt wurden; sie sind nicht nur zahlreich in unseren Bibliotheken vertreten, sondern tragen oft Spuren der Benutzung, handschriftliche Eintragungen als Niederschlag von Vorlesungen oder intensiver eigener Lektüre³⁷. Eines der Werke, das zu den Anthologien gerechnet werden kann, ist Wimpfeling's *Adolescentia*.

Wimpfeling studierte in Freiburg, Erfurt — wieder Erfurt — und Heidelberg und wirkte dann dort, in Speyer, Straßburg, Freiburg, Basel und Schlettstadt. Einen antiken Autor hat er nie ediert oder kommentiert, also auch keine Schrift, keine Rede Ciceros; und doch soll er hier nicht übergangen werden — so wie viele andere übergangen werden müssen — weil Wimpfeling's Schriften lehren, daß nicht nur Editionen und Kommentare das Interesse an Cicero geweckt oder zur Beschäftigung mit ihm veranlaßt haben.

Sein *Isidoneus* entwickelt ein pädagogisches Programm, das die Mißstände, gegen die er sich wendet, ebenso deutlich werden läßt, wie die ihm wesentlichen Neuerungen. Die Grammatik soll nicht um ihrer selbst willen gelehrt werden, sondern damit der Schüler lernt, Lateinisch zu verstehen, zu sprechen, zu schreiben und lateinische Texte zu lesen.

³⁵ Soweit sich die Entwicklung aus den Ordnungen der norddeutschen Schulen ablesen läßt, ist sie kürzlich durch U. Schindel, "Die 'auctores' im Unterricht deutscher Stadtschulen ...", in: B. Moeller et al. (edd.), *Studien zum städtischen Bildungswesen des späten Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit* (Göttingen 1983), S. 430-452, dargestellt worden.

³⁶ Erinnerungen an die Schulzeit ebenso wie Hinweise auf den Schul- und Universitätsunterricht finden sich oft in Vorlesungsankündigungen oder Einführungsvorlesungen, Vorreden oder Widmungsepisteln; zu den Schülergesprächen vgl. nur A. Bömer, *Die lateinischen Schülergespräche der Humanisten I/II* (Berlin 1897-1899); weitere Titel bei G. Streckenbach, *Stiltheorie und Rhetorik der Römer im Spiegel der humanistischen Schülergespräche* (Göttingen 1979), S. 206-207; sie scheinen mir bisher ebensowenig ausreichend ausgewertet zu sein wie die Schuldramen, die hier auch nicht alle aufgezählt werden können.

³⁷ Zu einigen Textausgaben s.u. S. 107-108 mit A. 113-120.

Überflüssiges — und das geht wieder gegen Alexanders *Doctrinale* — ist wegzulassen; nur das ist zu lesen und zu lernen, was die Entwicklung der Fähigkeiten der Schüler fördert. Diesem Ziel dienen Übersetzungsübungen und die Lektüre von Autoren, von denen man “*propriissimas dictionum significantias optimorum*” lernen kann. Das klingt nicht ganz ciceronisch³⁸. Wenn Wimpfeling auch früh in einer Rede andeutet, daß Cicero für ihn gleichsam Maßstab und Ideal ist (“*si Tullianus mihi lepor inesset*”)³⁹, wenn für ihn die Rhetorik selbst aus Cicero zu gewinnen ist (“*nonne et ipsa rhetorica quam ex Cicerone consequimur ars est liberalis?*”)⁴⁰, so räumt er Cicero keineswegs eine Sonderstellung im Lektürekanon ein. Wie schon in der früheren Schrift *Elegantiarum medulla* (1493, später neugestaltet unter dem Titel *Elegantiae maiores*), ist er im Bewußtsein der eigenen “barbaries”, die den Deutschen vorgeworfen wird und die er nicht abstreitet, eher besorgt, daß auch seine Landsleute beredt werden⁴¹ — er verfaßt übrigens auch eine Schrift gegen eine gewisse Unsitte im deutschen Sprachgebrauch, während eine ihm zugeschriebene Übersetzung nicht von ihm stammt⁴².

Für die Lektüre empfiehlt er “eloquentes”, und da nennt er Vergil, Lucan, Horaz, Plautus, Terenz neben Sallust, Valerius Maximus, Seneca und Cicero, von dem er neben den Briefen nur philosophische Schriften anführt, außerdem natürlich christliche Autoren wie Ambrosius, Hieronymus und Laktanz; für den “ornatus” ist die Auswahl beschränkter⁴³. Überdies klagt er, daß die italienischen Humanisten heidnische Schriftsteller kommentieren, nicht aber christliche⁴⁴. Ziel ist, wenn auch nicht

³⁸ Benutzt ist eine Ausgabe s.l.s.a. (1497, vgl. L. Hain *loc. cit.* [s.o. A. 7] II 2, wohl 16180), das Zitat f. XV^r; “*significantia*” ist bei Quintilian belegt, aber “*propriissimus*” gibt es antik nicht, “*propriissime*” nur Boeth., *Aristot. top.* I 6.

³⁹ J. Knepper *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 33) S. 28 A. 2, zitiert aus Wimpfelings Rede an den Wormser Klerus.

⁴⁰ f. XV^r.

⁴¹ f. XVI^r; s. auch *Elegantiarum medulla* ..., Widmungsbrief an Th. Gresmund (D. Gresemund), datiert 12.6.1493 in Speyer, dort auch 1493 gedruckt (auch in den späteren Ausgaben abgedruckt, allerdings in der Ausgabe Leipzig 1503 mit falscher Datierung [1491]).

⁴² *Epistola ... De inepta et superflua verborum resolutione* ... s.l.s.a. (1503), vgl. dazu J. Knepper *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 33), S. XIII und S. 173-174; zu der nicht von Wimpfeling stammenden Übersetzung von Cicerós *Cato* s. F. J. Worstbrock *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 31), S. 54 (153).

⁴³ f. XVIII^r; zum “ornatus”: f. XXIII^r; dort betont Wimpfeling auch die Notwendigkeit, beim Lehren und Lernen die richtige Reihenfolge zu beachten und das Überflüssige zu vermeiden.

⁴⁴ f. XIX^r: “*Multos enim videmus praestantes commentatores, et eos quidem italos, in dies ethnicos ac impudicissimos poetas interpretari, ad Christianos autem et sanctissimos manum apponere nullum*”.

ausschließlich, das Verständnis der Bibel, das Verständnis der Kirchenväter, eine religiös bestimmte Erziehung, weswegen Autoren wie Juvenal, Ovid und Martial u.a. verbannt werden⁴⁵. Doch wie Wimpfeling die Lektüre heidnischer Werke aus stilistischen Gründen rechtfertigt, will er auch für die moralische Erziehung nicht auf sie verzichten.

In der *Adolescentia* (1500) greift er viele seiner Grundsätze wieder auf, die überlegte Reihenfolge der Lektüre, die Betonung der sittlichen Komponente. Um sie im einzelnen zu begründen und zu illustrieren, führt Wimpfeling zahlreiche Belege aus heidnischen und christlichen Autoren in bunter Folge an "quae ad bonos mores et ad splendidas virtutes iuventuti decoras attinere mihi videntur"⁴⁶. Wie aus vielen anderen Autoren werden auch aus Cicero längere oder kürzere Passagen zitiert; doch ausführlich herangezogen wird neben Zeitgenossen und Autoren der jüngsten Vergangenheit nur Ovid⁴⁷: Cicero interessiert als einer unter vielen, seine philosophischen Schriften wie im *Isidoneus* für die moralische Belehrung — Wimpfeling's Schüler Iodocus Gallus hält 1488 in Heidelberg eine Vorlesung über die Schrift *De officiis*⁴⁸ — seine rhetorischen für die rhetorische Ausbildung, die Briefe als Muster für den Stil, den es vor allem für das Abfassen von Briefen zu schulen gilt.

Schaut man sich um, welche Schriften unter Ciceros Namen in der ersten Generation nach der Erfindung der Buchdruckerkunst (bis etwa 1490) in dem hier behandelten Raum gedruckt wurden, ergibt sich ein entsprechendes Bild: 25 philosophische Schriften, dagegen nur drei Ausgaben von Reden (*In Catilinam*: Köln 1474, *Pro Milone*: Löwen 1480, *Pro Archia*: Bamberg 1485)⁴⁹, außerdem Sammlungen von Wörtern und Phrasen unter dem Titel *Liber de proprietatibus terminorum* (in Deutschland viermal vor 1490 gedruckt)⁵⁰. Ganz ähnlich sieht es mit den Handbüchern aus: Neben Grammatiken gibt es Anweisungen zum

⁴⁵ f. XVIII.

⁴⁶ Benutzt ist die Ausgabe Straßburg 1500, ergänzend herangezogen die Ausgabe von O. Herding (s.o. A. 29): f. 1^r; S. 190 (Herding).

⁴⁷ f. 47^r-53^r; S. 296-313 (Herding).

⁴⁸ Vgl. O. Herding (ed.), *Jakob Wimpfeling/Beatus Rhenanus, Das Leben des Johannes Geiler von Kayserberg*, München 1970, S. 45; zu Iodocus Gallus aus Ruffach s. K. Hartfelder, "Zur Gelehrten-geschichte Heidelbergs", in: *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 45, N.F. 6 (1891), 163-168; Ch. Schmidt, *Histoire littéraire de l'Alsace* I/II (Paris 1879), II 40-46.

⁴⁹ Vgl. die Übersicht im *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 6 (Leipzig 1934), S. 504-513.

⁵⁰ Vgl. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 6 (1934), S. 676-678, Nr. 7024-7027, dann zwei weitere Nr. 7028 und 7029 bis 1500, alle in Deutschland gedruckt; daneben erschien eine zweite, verbesserte Fassung in Padua 1483 (Nr. 7030) und eine Sammlung unter dem Titel *Synonyma* in vier verschiedenen Fassungen in Italien (S. 678-683, Nr. 7031-7040).

Abfassen von Briefen, außerdem stilistische Handbücher, wobei man sich fast ausschließlich auf italienische Humanisten stützt (Franciscus Niger für die Briefstellerei oder Augustinus Datus für den Stil)⁵¹. Man will der Praxis dienen, der stilistischen Schulung ebenso wie der moralischen und religiösen Erziehung. Daher macht Wimpfeling auch vor dem Adel nicht halt, wie sich nicht erst in der *Adolescentia* zeigt (Kap. 3; 7). Schon in seiner *Philippica* (sechs Dialoge, 1498 Pfalzgraf Philipp, Herzog von Bayern, gewidmet) wendet er sich nachdrücklich gegen die Unbildung der Herrschenden: "Nimmt so ein Mensch einmal an einer Beratung teil, so sitzt er da nur mit seinem Körper wie ein Klotz, sein Geist und sein Denken aber ist bei Jagdhunden und Rossen, Waffen und Tänzen"⁵². Entsprechend fordert er die Pflege der lateinischen Sprache auch für die Fürsten, ebenso wie die Förderung der Wissenschaften durch die Regierenden, eine Forderung, die man nie verstummen lassen sollte (vgl. auch Wimpfeling's *Agatharchia*: 1498, eine Schrift, die auch die Pflege von Bildung und Wissenschaft zu den Pflichten der Herrschenden rechnet)⁵³.

Alle Schriften Wimpfeling's zeigen, daß es ihm wie Albrecht von Eyb und Agricola darum geht, aus den Werken der antiken Autoren für die Praxis nützliche und brauchbare Hilfen bereitzustellen; offensichtlich hat er andere Sorgen als Politian und Cortesi, die in eben diesen Jahren ihren Streit um die "imitatio Ciceronis" ausfechten.

Und wo steht Konrad Celtis, den man als Widerpart von Wimpfeling bezeichnet hat⁵⁴? Konrad Celtis, 1459 in Wipfeld bei Schweinfurt geboren, studierte in Köln, das ganz von der Scholastik geprägt war, bevor er in Heidelberg Agricolas Schüler wurde, wenn auch nur für

⁵¹ Franciscus Niger, *Methodus epistolandi*, erschienen zuerst(?) bei M. Kachelofen in Leipzig (s.a., zwischen 1487 und 1495, vgl. L. Hain, *Repertorium* II 1, S. 504 Nr. 11861, spätere Ausgaben ebda. S. 504-506 Nr. 11862-11884). Zu A. Datus s. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 7 (Leipzig 1938), S. 289-320 (107 Drucke, darunter nicht wenige in Deutschland erschienene).

⁵² "Si quandoque consultacioni adest, corpore assidet ut truncus, animus autem et cogitacio est apud canes venaticos, caballos, lanceas, arma, choreas"; die Übersetzung zitiert nach J. Knepper *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 33), S. 109, zur *Philippica* (gedruckt Straßburg 1498) s. J. Knepper ebda. S. 108-111; B. Singer, *Die Fürstenspiegel in Deutschland im Zeitalter des Humanismus und der Reformation* (München 1981), S. 75-76; 198-199.

⁵³ Zuerst erschienen Straßburg 1498, s. dazu J. Knepper *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 33), S. 111-119; B. Singer *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 52), S. 76-78; S. 174-249.

⁵⁴ O. Herding, "Der elsässische Humanist Jakob Wimpfeling und seine Erziehungsschrift 'Adolescentia'", *Zeitschrift für Württembergische Landesgeschichte* 22 (1963), S. 2. Literatur zu Celtis verzeichnet H. Rupprich *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 3), S. 784-785.

kurze Zeit. Nach Agricolas Tod (1485) wandte er sich nach Erfurt⁵⁵, dann nach Leipzig, wo er lehrte, und zwar ganz im Sinne der Humanisten ein wenig Griechisch, Horaz und Ciceros Rhetorik⁵⁶. Die *Ars versificandi et carminum*, die wohl auf seinen Vorlesungen aufbaut, wurde 1486 und 1494 gedruckt, ein *Tractatus de praeceptis rhetoris* blieb unveröffentlicht und scheint verloren gegangen zu sein⁵⁷. Wichtig für Celtis' Grundeinstellung ist, daß er als nächstes zwei Senecatragödien edierte. Er suchte also antike Texte zugänglich zu machen, aber es war Dichtung, die ihn beschäftigte, nicht Prosa, und zwar Tragödien, die, wie er in den Vorreden betonte, moralische Lehren zu vermitteln vermögen. Es ging ihm um den Inhalt, nicht um die Form⁵⁸.

Seine *Ars* trug ihm 1487 die Krönung zum *poeta laureatus* durch Friedrich III. in Nürnberg ein — anschließend verbrachte er zwei Jahre in Italien, wo er u.a. mit dem Ciceroherausgeber Philippus Beroaldus verkehrte, zwei weitere in Krakau, wo er sich Mathematik und Astronomie zuwandte, für die man dort bessere Dozenten finden konnte als an irgendeiner anderen Universität nördlich der Alpen⁵⁹. Aber auch der Humanismus hatte in Krakau Fuß gefaßt. Schon vor Celtis' Ankunft wurden Vorlesungen über Cicero gehalten, auch über Vergil, Ovid, Statius, Horaz und Juvenal⁶⁰; und so las auch Celtis hier neben seinen

⁵⁵ Zu Erfurt s. G. Bauch, *Erfurt* (s.o. A. 7), S. 67-72; dort war C. Mutianus sein Schüler (Literatur zu ihm verzeichnet H. Rupprich *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 3), S. 785-786). Zu Celtis' Kritik am Kölner Lehrbetrieb und der dort herrschenden Scholastik s. seine Ode III 21, bes. 22-23: "Maronianos et Ciceronios libros verentur", vgl. C. Celtis ... *libri Odarum quatuor* (Straßburg 1513), f. L II'-III' (= F. Pindter [ed.], *Conradus Celtis. Libri odarum quatuor* ... [Leipzig 1937], S. 86).

⁵⁶ L. W. Spitz, *Conrad Celtis. The German Arch-Humanist* (Cambridge Mass. 1957), S. 5.

⁵⁷ Zur *ars* ... s. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 6 (1934), S. 363-365, Nr. 6460 (Leipzig um 1486) und 6461 (Leipzig 1494, hier benutzt; im Widmungsgedicht verspricht Celtis Kürze und betont die Bedeutung der Nachahmung: f. A II'-III'); der *tractatus* ... wird in der *ars* ..., f. C II' erwähnt. Zur *ars* s. jetzt F. J. Worstbrock, "Die 'Ars versificandi et carminum' des Konrad Celtis. Ein Lehrbuch eines deutschen Humanisten", in: B. Moeller et al. (edd.), *Studien zum städtischen Bildungswesen des späten Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit* (Göttingen 1983), S. 462-498.

⁵⁸ Vgl. L. Hain, *Repertorium* (s.o. A. 7) II 2, S. 314 Nr. 14673 und D. Reichling, *Appendices ad Hainii Copingeri Repertorium Bibliographicum I/VI* (mit Indices und Suppl.), (München 1905-1914), III, S. 78 Nr. 1061, dazu G. Bauch, *Leipziger Frühhumanismus* (s.o. A. 7), S. 19-20; Celtis' zentrale Anliegen werden auch in seiner *Panegyris ad duces Bavariae* ... deutlich, zuerst gedruckt Augsburg 1492, vgl. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 6 (1934), S. 367-368 Nr. 6466 (mit der *oratio in gymnasio in Ingolstadt publice recitata*; wiederum zusammen ediert von I. Rupprich, Leipzig 1932).

⁵⁹ Vgl. G. Bauch, "Deutsche Scholaren" (s.o. A. 7), S. 34-37, zur Astronomie S. 4-10.

⁶⁰ Vgl. G. Bauch, "Deutsche Scholaren" (s.o. A. 7), S. 12.

naturwissenschaftlichen Studien über Rhetorik, Dichtkunst und die Kunst des Briefschreibens, bis ihn sein unruhiger Geist weiter trieb. Die junge Universität Ingolstadt, bei deren Eröffnung im Jahre 1472 der Jurist M. Mair in einer Festrede den Wert der Studien mit Ciceros bekannten Sätzen aus der Rede für Archias unterstrich⁶¹ und an der früh eine Reihe bekannter Humanisten wirkte und studierte, u.a. Jakob Locher⁶², bot Celtis eine Stellung, die es ihm erlaubte, eine Vorlesung über Ciceros Rhetorik zu halten. Gleichsam als Textgrundlage dafür — höchst aufschlußreich für sein Lehrverfahren — läßt er eine *Epitoma in utramque Ciceronis rhetoricam* drucken, die teilweise selbständig formuliert, sich in ihren Definitionen und Beispielen aber eng an die Vorbilder anschließt. Ergänzt wird das Werk durch Regeln für die Kunst des Memorierens und eine Anleitung *de condendis epistolis* mit Beispielen, u.a. einem sehr persönlich gehaltenen Liebesbrief; dieser Anhang ist später oft nachgedruckt worden⁶³.

Das Programm seiner Bemühungen umreißt Celtis mehrfach. In der Widmungsvorrede zur *Epitoma* (an König Maximilian) verleiht er der Hoffnung Ausdruck, daß die jungen Hörer, wenn sie die Einführung in die Rhetorik gekostet haben, sich zu den Höhen der Beredsamkeit Ciceros und eines Wettstreites mit den literarischen Leistungen der Italiener aufschwingen können⁶⁴. In der Vorlesungsankündigung beklagt er die verbreitete Unfähigkeit an den Universitäten Deutschlands, Cicero zu erläutern, und nennt als Ziel seiner Bemühungen, daß der "ganze Cicero verstanden wird, wie er mit deutscher, nicht mit lateinischer Zunge spricht" ("ut totus iam Cicero non Rhomana sed Germana lingua loqui intellegatur"). Das wird den Hörern nützlich sein beim Predigen, bei Rechtsfällen, beim Ratgeben, beim Abfassen von Briefen, beim Gebet, im Gespräch⁶⁵. Die große Antrittsvorlesung⁶⁶ läßt

⁶¹ Vgl. G. Bauch, *Die Anfänge des Humanismus in Ingolstadt* (München 1901), S. 3-4, allgemein zu den ersten Humanisten ebda. S. 4-30, u.a. S. Karoch (S. 7-8), Johann von Dalberg (S. 28, vgl. o. A. 20) und P. Niavis (S. 28, vgl. u. A. 113).

⁶² Vgl. G. Bauch, *Ingolstadt* (s.o. A. 61), S. 29; G. Heidloff, *Untersuchungen zu Leben und Werk des Humanisten Jakob Locher Philomusus (1471-1528)*, Diss. phil. Freiburg 1971 (Münster 1975), S. 143-145; zur späteren Tätigkeit Lochers in Ingolstadt ebda., S. 155-172.

⁶³ Gedruckt zuerst Ingolstadt 1492, vgl. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 6 (1934), S. 365-366 Nr. 6463; der *tractatus* ... wird später gern zusammen mit ähnlichen Werken von Vives, Erasmus und Hegendorffinus (s.u. A. 122) gedruckt.

⁶⁴ "Si quando nostri adolescentes et bonarum artium studiosi illud praegustamentum (i.e. epitomen) ... imbiberint, facile dein in ciceronianam eloquentiam et italicarum litterarum emulationem assurgere possunt" (praefatio ohne Seitenzählung).

⁶⁵ Vgl. die Vorlesungsankündigung in Ingolstadt, abgedruckt in: H. Rupprich (ed.), *Der Briefwechsel des Konrad Celtis* (München 1934), S. 55-57, Zitat 57.

⁶⁶ Zuerst Augsburg 1492 (s.o. A. 58), auch in: H. Rupprich, *Humanismus* (s.o. A. 21), S. 226-238.

die nationale Aufgabe noch unmittelbarer hervortreten, die Celtis besonders der adligen Jugend ins Bewußtsein ruft ebenso wie die grundlegende Bedeutung des Wissens, vor allem dessen, was "philosophia" und "eloquentia" zu lehren vermögen. Cicero wird nicht genannt, vielmehr wird nur allgemein auf die Schriften der antiken Philosophen, Dichter und Redner verwiesen, die allein die rechte Lebensweise für uns beschrieben haben. Wie Celtis am Schluß erneut hervorhebt, soll die Lektüre von Philosophen und Rednern den einzelnen befähigen, selbst zu formulieren, selbst zu dichten, selbst Geschichte zu schreiben und dadurch für sich Unsterblichkeit, für das Vaterland Ruhm und Anerkennung zu erringen⁶⁷.

Hier werden neue Ziele gesetzt. Um sie zu erreichen, kann Ciceros Werk, vor allem seine rednerische Praxis höchstens einen begrenzten Beitrag leisten. Der Erzhumanist wächst weit über die Programme der Schulmeister und deren Forderung nach Aneignung sprachlicher und stilistischer Fähigkeiten hinaus; er entwickelt vor den jungen Studenten neue Perspektiven, die den kleinlichen Streit über ciceronianische Formulierungen vergessen lassen und ganz im Sinne Agricolas vom Einzelnen fordern, seine eigenen Fähigkeiten zu entwickeln, nicht mehr allein um die alltäglichen Probleme zu bewältigen, die er am Ende der Vorlesungsankündigung nannte, sondern neue, größere, die es mit Hilfe der neu entdeckten Möglichkeiten und Kenntnisse und den durch sie vermehrten und verstärkten eigenen Kräften zu lösen gilt.

Gewiß bestehen grundsätzliche Unterschiede zwischen dem wandernden Poeten Celtis und dem Theologen Wimpfeling — und doch haben auch sie zwei Züge gemeinsam, ein stark ausgeprägtes deutsches Nationalgefühl, dessen Ziel es ist, den Leistungen der Italiener gleichzukommen oder sie gar zu überflügeln, und eine Wertschätzung Ciceros, die die Bedeutung seiner rhetorischen Theorie zu würdigen weiß, sie aber nicht überschätzt, d.h. Cicero nicht zum alleinigen Maßstab und Mittelpunkt aller Bemühungen macht. Klagte Wimpfeling, der nie in Italien war, daß man dort eher heidnische Autoren kommentierte als christliche, und begnügte er sich damit, einzelne Stücke aus paganen Werken zu exzerpieren, ohne je eine Edition zu veranstalten oder einen Kommentar zu verfassen, so erkannte Celtis früh den Wert von Textausgaben, nicht erst während seines Aufenthaltes in Italien, der eher sein Nationalgefühl wachsen ließ. Zeigte er sich schon 1491 besorgt, die Italiener zu dem

⁶⁷ Vgl. H. Rupprich, *Humanismus* (s.o. A. 21), S. 238.

Zugeständnis zu bringen, daß auch der Glanz der Wissenschaft und Literatur zu den Deutschen gekommen wäre (“et litterarum splendorem ad Germanos commigrasse”), so betonte er zehn Jahre später nicht nur, daß die Buchdruckerkunst in Deutschland erfunden wäre, sondern daß er es gleichsam als ein nationales Verdienst ansähe, wenn ein Deutscher einen griechischen oder lateinischen Text druckte⁶⁸. Wir werden sehen, daß sein Schüler Locher sehr früh in diesem Sinne tätig war. Doch soll zuvor ein Blick auf den dritten *poeta laureatus* dieser Generation geworfen werden, Heinrich Bebel.

Heinrich Bebel, ein Bauernsohn aus Justingen (wohl 1472 geboren), erwarb nach erstem Unterricht in der Heimat das Baccalaureat in Krakau, wo er Schüler von Laurentius Corvinus war⁶⁹. Anschließend ging er für kurze Zeit nach Basel (1495-1496) und hörte dort Sebastian Brant, dessen *Narrenschiff* gerade veröffentlicht worden war (1494). Schon 1496 erhielt Bebel die seit längerem (1481) bestehende, aber nicht besetzte Stelle eines Lehrers der Beredsamkeit und Dichtung an der Universität Tübingen, die er bis zu seinem Tode innehatte (1518)⁷⁰.

Bekannt wurde Bebel durch seine Dichtungen, für die er schon 1501 zum *poeta laureatus* gekrönt wurde, vor allem allerdings durch die erst später entstandenen und gedruckten *Facetiae*, die seinen Witz, seine Beobachtungsgabe und sein sprachliches Können zeigen, und durch den ebenfalls späteren *Triumphus Veneris*, der seiner moralischen Kritik noch deutlicheren Ausdruck verleiht⁷¹. Doch wichtiger sind hier neben der

⁶⁸ Vgl. H. Rupprich (ed.), *Briefwechsel* (s.o. A. 65), S. 29 (epist. 15: 1491); S. 463 (epist. 267, Vorrede zur Ausgabe der Hroswitha von Gandersheim, 1501).

⁶⁹ Vgl. G. W. Zapf, *Heinrich Bebel nach seinem Leben und Schriften* (Augsburg 1802); weitere Literatur nennt H. Rupprich *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 3), S. 789-790; zum Aufenthalt in Krakau s. G. Bauch, “Deutsche Scholaren” (s.o. A. 7), S. 41-42; J. Haller, *Die Anfänge der Universität Tübingen 1477-1537* I/II (Stuttgart 1927-1929), I, S. 212-213; II, S. 77; W. Barner (ed.), *Heinrich Bebel. Comoedia de optimo studio iuvenum* (Stuttgart 1982), S. 124-125; S. 130-131. Zu L. Corvinus vgl. G. Bauch, “Deutsche Scholaren” (s.o. A. 7), S. 28-30, zu Bebels Ausgabe der *Cosmographia* des Corvinus vgl. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 7 (1938), S. 182-183 Nr. 7799.

⁷⁰ Zur Tübinger Stelle vgl. H. A. Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation* (Tübingen 1977), S. 20-21; W. Barner *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 123-124; J. Locher und S. Karoch haben sie wohl nie innegehabt. Zum Basler Aufenthalt vgl. G. W. Zapf *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 13-14, J. Haller *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69) I, S. 213; II, S. 77; W. Barner *loc. cit.*, S. 131-133.

⁷¹ *Facetiae*, entstanden seit 1505, gedruckt zuerst 1508, vgl. J. Haller *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69) I, S. 215-217; II, S. 78; *Triumphus Veneris* entstanden 1502, gedruckt zuerst 1509, vgl. G. W. Zapf *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 224-240; dazu auch J. Haller *loc. cit.* I, S. 214-215; II, S. 78; W. Barner *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 170, der 1508 als Jahr des ersten Druckes angibt. Zur Dichterkrönung vgl. W. Barner *loc. cit.*, S. 103-106.

1506 zuerst publizierten *Ars versificandi* solche Schriften wie die *Commentaria epistolarum conficiendarum*⁷², die *Commentaria de abusione linguae latinae apud germanos*⁷³, das *Opusculum qui authores legendi sint ad comparandam eloquentiam*⁷⁴, die *Comoedia de optimo studio scholasticorum*⁷⁵, die *Oratio de utilitate linguae latinae*⁷⁶ und das *Opusculum de institutione puerorum*⁷⁷, die alle eine weite Gelehrsamkeit zeigen, die Bebel als Grundlage dient, um seine Prinzipien für Erziehung und Unterricht zu entwerfen und Lehrbücher für die Praxis zu verfassen⁷⁸.

Cicero wird eine bevorzugte Rolle eingeräumt⁷⁹, wie denn auch bekannt ist, daß Bebel über Cicero Vorlesungen gehalten hat, und zwar neben solchen über Horaz, Persius, Vergil, Florus, Curtius, Justin und Laktanz, über die Schriften *De oratore*, *Paradoxa* und *De senectute*⁸⁰; aber das Lob Ciceros bleibt allgemein und rückt die formalen Aspekte in den Vordergrund, während der Inhalt zurücktritt, wenn auch etwa bei der Auswahl der Autoren einige aus moralischen Gründen abgelehnt werden⁸¹. Entsprechend werden Ciceros philosophische Schriften auch nicht ausdrücklich zur Lektüre empfohlen, und für die stilistische Schulung gilt er zwar als Vorbild, aber nicht als einziges⁸²; vielmehr nennt

⁷² Die *Ars* ... wurde nach W. Barner *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 137-138 zu Lebzeiten Bebel's zwölfmal gedruckt, ebenso oft die *Commentaria* ..., (Widmung 1500, zuerst gedruckt Straßburg 1503), dazu J. Haller *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69) I, S. 223; II, S. 80.

⁷³ Widmung 1500, zuerst gedruckt Straßburg 1503, vgl. J. Haller *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69) I, S. 223; II, S. 79-81.

⁷⁴ Gewidmet dem Kanzler Johannes Vergenhans, zuerst gedruckt 1504, vgl. J. Haller *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69) I, S. 223; II, S. 81-84; benutzt im Sammelband *Opusculum ... de institutione puerorum ... (et alia)* (Straßburg 1513).

⁷⁵ 1501 aufgeführt, Widmung an Ludwig Vergenhans (1501), zuerst gedruckt 1504, vgl. J. Haller *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69) I, S. 223; II, S. 81; W. Barner *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), *passim*.

⁷⁶ Auch *Oratio de utilitate latinitatis*, gehalten 1503, gedruckt zuerst 1504, vgl. J. Haller *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69) I, S. 223; II, S. 81.

⁷⁷ Widmung 1506, gedruckt Straßburg 1513, vgl. G. W. Zapf *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 268-269; ein Exemplar ist u.a. in der Universitätsbibliothek in Cambridge vorhanden.

⁷⁸ Vgl. J. Haller *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 223-225.

⁷⁹ So heißt es im *Opusculum qui authores* ...: "Hinc Cicero pro omnibus et ante omnes pedestris orationis scriptores ... legendus est ..." (1513 f. AIII^v, vgl. o. A. 74).

⁸⁰ Vgl. seine Rede *De necessitate linguae Latinae* (abgedruckt bei G. W. Zapf *loc. cit.* [s.o. A. 69], S. 293-308), S. 294; zu dieser Rede s. J. Haller *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69) I, S. 226; II, S. 82.

⁸¹ Vgl. *Opusculum qui authores* ... f. BIII^v (1513, s.o. A. 74); zu dem von Bebel betonten moralischen Wert der Poesie s. W. Barner *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 149, zu Ähnlichkeiten und Unterschieden zwischen Bebel und Wimpfeling vgl. O. Herding (ed.), *Adolescentia* (s.o. A. 29), S. 71-74.

⁸² Bebel selbst nimmt sich eher Quintilian zum Vorbild, vgl. H. J. Kaemmel, *Geschichte des deutschen Schulwesens* ... (Leipzig 1882), S. 275.

Bebel neben ihm Livius, Seneca und Laktanz, den “Christianus Cicero”, eine Formulierung, die Cicero doch wieder als Maßstab erscheinen läßt⁸³. Allerdings kann Bebel die “utilitas Latinitatis” auch anhand von Vergil demonstrieren⁸⁴; denn als unbedingt notwendig erscheint ihm die Fähigkeit, Lateinisch verstehen und sprechen zu können, und zwar für die “artium studiosi” wie für die Theologen und die Juristen, und er geht so weit, von den Büchern der Rechtsgelehrten (“iurisconsulti”) zu sagen, daß deren “character modusque dicendi proxime ad Ciceronis eloquentiam accedit”⁸⁵.

Wie Wimpfeling war Bebel nie in Italien, wenn er auch manchen italienischen Humanisten schätzte, vor allem Valla⁸⁶; wie Wimpfeling edierte Bebel nie einen griechischen oder lateinischen Text, wenn er auch mit der antiken Literatur gut vertraut war und dazu mit der römischen Geschichte und den römischen Institutionen⁸⁷; wie Wimpfeling lag auch ihm die Besserung der Moral am Herzen; wie Wimpfeling und Celtis bestimmte Bebel ein ausgeprägtes Nationalbewußtsein (das sich bei ihm mit Schwabenstolz verband)⁸⁸, wie seine Vorgänger trat er für die “studia humanitatis” ein, und das heißt gegen Unbildung und Unfähigkeit⁸⁹, vor allem gegen die traditionelle Grammatik — es ist wichtig, daß auch Bebel dies noch für notwendig hielt⁹⁰ — und für eine sorgfältige sprachliche und stilistische Schulung, bei der er Cicero eine wesentliche Funktion zubilligt, aber neben ihm auch andere gelten läßt. Stolz kann er nach einigen Jahren verkünden: “Multum profeci: habeo sequaces, passim auditur sermo latinior et tersior im (sic!) publicis privatisque orationibus apud thübingenses nostros. Bonique id mihi

⁸³ Vgl. *Opusculum qui authores* ..., f. AIII^{r-v} (1513, s.o. A. 74). Laktanz wird auch in der *Comoedia de optimo studio* ... “Christianus Cicero” genannt vgl. W. Barner *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 66, dazu S. 146-147. Gleichsam als Maßstab erscheint Cicero auch, wenn Bebel in einem Epigramm an Johann Astmann diesen “doctus mellifluo cum Cicerone loqui” nennt (abgedruckt bei G. W. Zapf *loc. cit.* [s.o. A. 69], S. 68).

⁸⁴ Vgl. die *Oratio de utilitate linguae Latinae* (s.o. A. 76), dazu W. Barner *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 146-147.

⁸⁵ *De necessitate linguae Latinae*, G. W. Zapf *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 300-301.

⁸⁶ Vgl. dazu J. Haller *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69) I, S. 222; II, S. 80.

⁸⁷ Vgl. dazu G. W. Zapf *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 193; J. Haller *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69) I, S. 222; II, S. 80.

⁸⁸ Vgl. J. Haller *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69) I, S. 218-221; S. 229; II, S. 78-79; S. 84.

⁸⁹ Vgl. J. Haller *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69) I, S. 227-228; S. 234-235; II, S. 83; S. 87; W. Barner *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 139; S. 152-153.

⁹⁰ Zur Ablehnung des *Doctrinale* s. W. Barner *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 148, ferner die Rede *De necessitate linguae Latinae* (s.o. A. 80), bes. S. 297-298.

acceptum referunt; primumque praedicare consueverunt, qui Barbari-
 ex nostro gymnasio infestis signis aliqua ex parte deturbaverim”⁹¹.
 Darin liegt die besondere Bedeutung Bebels, daß er nicht nur Programme
 entwickelte und Reden hielt oder Lehrbücher verfaßte, sondern über
 viele Jahre einen einflußreichen und wirksamen Unterricht erteilte und
 einen großen Kreis von Schülern um sich versammelte, die von ihm
 lernten und das Gelernte weiter vermittelten. Dabei galt der Kampf der
 “barbaries”, die Sorge der “latinitas”; für oder wider den Ciceronianis-
 mus zu streiten, kam niemandem in den Sinn, und auch für Kommen-
 tare zu Ciceros Werken war die Zeit in Deutschland noch nicht
 gekommen, obwohl immer häufiger Einzelausgaben seiner Schriften,
 auch seiner Reden gedruckt wurden, offenbar damit die Texte leichter in
 Vorlesungen erläutert werden konnten⁹². Doch der erste Kommentar
 eines deutschen Humanisten zu einer Rede Ciceros erschien erst 1517 in
 Augsburg; er stammte von Jakob Locher.

Auch Locher war Schwabe, 1471 in Ehingen an der Donau geboren;
 auch er genoß nach seinem eigenen Zeugnis einen guten Schulunter-
 richt⁹³, ein Beweis dafür, daß die vielfältigen Klagen über die Rückstän-
 digkeit, die Unfähigkeit, die “barbaries” der Deutschen nicht immer
 berechtigt waren. Er studierte — nicht in Erfurt, sondern — in Basel, wo
 er Sebastian Brants Schüler war, dessen *Narrenschiff* er wenige Jahre
 später ins Lateinische übersetzte⁹⁴, dann in Freiburg und schließlich in
 Ingolstadt, wo er wenigstens für einige Monate Gelegenheit hatte, Celtis’
 Vorlesungen zu hören und, wie er später stets gern bekannte, von ihm zu
 lernen⁹⁵. Anschließend lehrte er für kurze Zeit in Tübingen Poesie und
 Rhetorik⁹⁶, ehe auch er nach Italien aufbrach, wo Philippus Beroaldus
 d.Ä., der Ciceroherausgeber, und Johannes Baptista Pius in Bologna
 und Franciscus Niger in Ferrara und Venedig zu seinen Lehrern zähl-
 ten⁹⁷. Zurückgekehrt dozierte er zuerst in Freiburg, nach seiner Krönung

⁹¹ Zitat nach der Ausgabe Straßburg 1506 *Commentaria epistolarum conficiendarum et alia*, f. CLXVI^r. Zu Bebels Erfolgen s. J. Haller *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69) I, S. 235; II, S. 87-88, s. auch S. 77; S. 81; andere Urteile über Bebel finden sich bei W. Barner *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 69), S. 164-166.

⁹² Vgl. u. S. 107.

⁹³ Vgl. G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 62), S. 140-141; zu J. Locher s. jetzt auch P. Ukena in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 14 (1985), S. 743-744 (Literatur).

⁹⁴ Vgl. G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 62), S. 151-153; die wichtigsten Ausgaben aufgeführt ebda., S. 34-37.

⁹⁵ Vgl. G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 62), S. 143-145.

⁹⁶ Vgl. G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 62), S. 143; S. 145-147.

⁹⁷ Vgl. G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 62), S. 147-149.

zum *poeta laureatus* (1497) in Ingolstadt, nach Streitereien wieder in Freiburg und nach weiteren Streitereien auch dort, u.a. mit J. Wimpfeling und U. Zasius, seit 1507 (bis zu seinem Tode: 1528) in Ingolstadt, wo er keineswegs zu polemisieren aufhörte⁹⁸. Wie Bebel lehrte also auch er für viele Jahre an einem Ort, und wenn er auch ein unruhiger und streitsüchtiger Geist war und viel Zeit und Kraft auf kleinliche Fehden verschwendete — schon vor seiner Italienreise war er in Tübingen in Auseinandersetzungen mit dem dortigen Professor Johannes Lupftich verwickelt, bei denen es um Einzelheiten korrekten lateinischen Sprachgebrauchs ging⁹⁹ — trat er nicht weniger eifrig und kämpferisch für die “*studia humanitatis*” ein. Seine Sorge galt vor allem der Dichtung, wie seine Rede *De studio humanarum disciplinarum et laude poetarum*¹⁰⁰ zeigt. Denn die Dichtung vermag, wie er zu zeigen versuchte, die Erinnerung an die Großen früherer Generationen wachzuhalten. Zugleich aber betonte er, daß “*poetarum et oratorum disciplina*” den jungen Menschen nützt; denn “*ibi discimus barbara verba mitigare, mentis conceptus eleganter effari, discimus etiam quocumque tempore orate, copiose compositeque dicere ut nihil in spatioso terrarum orbe sit quod eloquio poetarum oratorumque suavissimo non docte terseque queat enunciari*”¹⁰¹.

Entsprechend bemühte sich Locher, seinen Schülern antike Autoren nahe zu bringen, und zwar nicht nur einen, sondern viele. Er hielt Vorlesungen über die wichtigsten Dichter, Catull, Tibull, Properz, Horaz, Ovid, Vergil, Persius, Lucan, Claudian, Seneca, Plautus, Terenz ebenso wie über zahlreiche Prosaiker, z.B. Valerius Maximus, Plinius und sogar Gellius, und gab eine Einführung in die Rhetorik nach Ciceros *De oratore* und einem eigenen bereits 1496 in Freiburg gedruckten Lehrbuch¹⁰². Schon vorher ließ er eine Ausgabe von Ciceros Reden für Archias und Marcellus “*cum argumentis, coloribus et rhetoricae partibus*”, wie er im Widmungsbrief an Christoph von Knöringen sagt, 1494 in Reutlingen drucken¹⁰³. Dem Text gehen ein kurzes “*argumentum*”

⁹⁸ Vgl. G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 62), S. 150-172.

⁹⁹ Vgl. dazu G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 62), S. 145.

¹⁰⁰ 1495-1496 bei Friedrich Riederer gedruckt, vgl. G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 62), S. 27-28; S. 205-222.

¹⁰¹ f. bIIv (Ausgabe 1495-1496).

¹⁰² *Epitoma Rhetorices graphicum*, vgl. dazu G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 62), S. 28-30.

¹⁰³ Vgl. G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 62), S. 21-22; zwei spätere Leipziger Drucke, um 1495 bei G. Boettiger und um 1500 bei J. Thanner erschienen, haben “*Beigaben*” von J. Locher, vgl. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 6 (1934), S. 556 Nr. 6785 und 6786; doch

und die Angabe des Streitpunktes, der” partes rhetoricae”, die sich hier demonstrieren lassen, und des “genus causae” (für *Pro Archia*) voraus; am Rande finden sich knappe elementare Hinweise zur Sache und auf die Redeteile, die Schlußformen und die rhetorischen Schmuckmittel¹⁰⁴. Damit gibt Locher seinen Schülern nicht nur einen Text in die Hand, wie vor ihm einige andere einzelne Reden Ciceros zugänglich machen (oder Celtis einzelne Tragödien Senecas), er führt sie durch seine Vorbemerkungen und Erläuterungen unmittelbar in das sachliche und rhetorische Verständnis der Reden ein. Man mag diese Randbemerkungen einen Kommentar nennen oder nicht: Hier begegnet die erste von einem Deutschen veranstaltete, nördlich der Alpen gedruckte Ausgabe von Reden Ciceros mit Erklärungen. Im Gefolge seiner italienischen Lehrer — in seiner Vorrede gedenkt er seines Studiums in Padua — sucht Locher seinen Schülern den Zugang zu Ciceros Redekunst zu eröffnen und fordert sie auf, die Reden “die noctuque legant, in his se exerceant, his denique se oblectent”¹⁰⁵.

Das heißt nicht, daß mit Locher und dessen ersten Erläuterungen zu einer Rede Ciceros der Ciceronianismus in Deutschland seinen Einzug hielt. Wie bereits angedeutet behandelte er in seinen Vorlesungen viele Autoren, und es überrascht daher nicht, daß ihm mehrere Editionen verdankt werden, z.B. der Werke des Horaz (mit Kommentar: Straßburg 1498), oder später der drei Bücher *De raptu Proserpinae* Claudians (1518), des *Panegyricus* des Plinius (1520), einiger Senecatragödien (1520), der *Mythologiarum libri* des Fulgentius (1521) und der *Naturalis historia* des Plinius (1522)¹⁰⁶. Bei der Erläuterung der Reden Ciceros ging es ihm nicht darum, das antike Werk um seiner selbst willen zu erklären. Wie er in der Rede *De studio humanarum disciplinarum et*

unterscheiden sich die Vorreden der Ausgaben von 1494 und 1500 erheblich voneinander. Jedenfalls erwähnt Locher in seiner Reutlinger Ausgabe entgegen der Behauptung von G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* 147 A. 1 seinen Studienaufenthalt in Italien (“Cum enim in patavino gymnasio humanitatis studio atque oratorie vacarem ...”); also ist die Datierung des Widmungsbriefes vom 5.I.1494 nicht in 1493 zu ändern, eher in 5.I.1495 (um den anderen chronologischen Schwierigkeiten zu entgegen, zumal es leicht möglich ist, daß man zu Jahresbeginn noch das vergangene Jahr angibt).

¹⁰⁴ Die *argumenta* für beide Reden sind fast identisch mit denen des Ant. Luschus (Loschi), ebenso das, was zu den Streitpunkten gesagt wird (Luschus’ Erläuterungen wurden zuerst mit Asconius’ Kommentaren 1477 in Venedig gedruckt).

¹⁰⁵ Diese Aufforderung findet sich in den Vorreden der beiden Ausgaben (von 1494 und 1500).

¹⁰⁶ Vgl. die Übersicht bei G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 62) zu Horaz: S. 48-50, zu den anderen Ausgaben: S. 94-96; S. 97-99; S. 102-105.

laude poetarum durchgehend den Nutzen der Dichtung herausstellte¹⁰⁷, will er die Kunst des antiken Redners ebenso wie dessen theoretische Überlegungen für die Praxis nutzbar machen. Deswegen studiert er Ciceros *Orator* sorgfältig¹⁰⁸ und faßt in einem *Compendium Rhetorices ex Tulliano thesauro diductum ac concinnatum* die wichtigsten Regeln zusammen, da die üblichen Handbücher zu ausführlich und teuer sind¹⁰⁹ — man erinnert sich an die Kritik an Agricolas *De inventione dialectica* — und veröffentlicht zugleich damit einen Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede *Pro Milone*, den jeder als Kommentar anerkennen wird¹¹⁰.

Auf ein "argumentum" und Angaben zur Art des Falles und zum rhetorischen "genus" (zu der hier vorliegenden Mischung von genera) sowie knappe Bemerkungen zum "exordium" folgen Einzelerklärungen zum Inhalt, zu einzelnen Anspielungen, zu juristischen Problemen, zu einzelnen Wörtern, zu den verschiedensten Topoi, zu rhetorischen Figuren und deren Funktion, schließlich Hinweise darauf, welche Regeln Cicero befolgt und mit welcher Absicht und mit welchem Erfolg er dies tut. Dabei verweist er auf andere Reden Ciceros und eine breite Auswahl antiker Autoren: Asconius, Quintilian und Macrobius ebenso wie Valerius Maximus oder Sueton, daneben auf Theoretiker jüngerer Zeit wie Georg von Trapezunt. Die enge Verknüpfung inhaltlicher und formaler Erläuterungen läßt keinen Zweifel, daß Locher die rhetorische Meisterschaft des antiken Redners in allen ihren Aspekten für den Lernenden verständlich machen will. Doch beschränkt er sich weder auf elementare Hinweise noch allein auf Erklärungen rhetorischer Natur; er ergänzt sie durch Erläuterungen zu Sachfragen. Damit scheint der Weg gebahnt zu sein für die mannigfachsten Formen der Kommentierung der Reden Ciceros.

Sogleich stellt sich eine ganze Fülle von Fragen: Welche Anregungen werden aufgegriffen, welche Gesichtspunkte treten neu auf, an welchen Orten werden Ciceros Reden in Vorlesungen erläutert, wo werden

¹⁰⁷ *Loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 100), f. bIIr.

¹⁰⁸ Vgl. G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 62), S. 156 A. 1 (Hinweis auf Lochers Handexemplar von Ciceros *Orator* mit Victor Pisanus' Kommentar, Venedig 1492). Zu Lochers Ausgabe des *Orator* (1517) s. G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* S. 89-90.

¹⁰⁹ Vgl. Lochers Widmungsbrief an Blasius Koetterle; zu den Ausgaben vgl. G. Heidloff *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 62), S. 86-87 und S. 91-93; ich habe nur die Ausgabe 1517 einsehen können.

¹¹⁰ Der Kommentar ist in den Sammelausgaben Basel 1553 (S. 1636-1642) und Lyon 1554 (S. 1345-1350) wieder abgedruckt.

Kommentare gedruckt, wer sind deren Verfasser, welche Zielsetzungen werden bei der Erklärung verfolgt, wohin führt die Entwicklung¹¹¹?

Fast vierzig Jahre verstrichen zwischen den ersten "humanistischen" Vorlesungen Peter Luders in Heidelberg (1456-1460) und dem Druck der ersten Erläuterungen zu Reden Ciceros aus der Feder eines Deutschen (Locher: Ingolstadt 1492); noch einmal vierzig Jahre mußten verstreichen, bis Kommentare anderer deutscher Verfasser zu Reden Ciceros gedruckt wurden. Zwar erschienen in Leipzig seit 1492 zahlreiche Einzelditionen, nicht nur im Anschluß an Lochers Ausgabe von *Pro Archia* mit Kommentar (1495; 1500)¹¹², sondern auch reine Textausgaben, besorgt z.B. von P. Niavis (Schneevogel)¹¹³, P. Aeolicus¹¹⁴, A. Epistates (Probst)¹¹⁵, G. Coellius und H. Tulichius¹¹⁶, andere in Krakau¹¹⁷ und

¹¹¹ Eine ausführliche Darstellung der Cicero-Studien in Deutschland, oder auch nur der Beschäftigung mit Ciceros Reden kann und soll hier nicht gegeben werden.

¹¹² Vgl. o. A. 103. Schon 1492 (oder früher) erscheint eine Ausgabe der Rede *Pro Marcello* bei K. Kachelofen, ohne daß ein Herausgeber genannt wird, eine weitere derselben Rede bei M. Landsberger 1497-1499, vgl. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 6 (1934), S. 558-559 Nr. 6790 und 6792. Zu den Leipziger Druckern s. J. Benzing, *Buchdruckerlexikon des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt 1952), S. 102-109; H. Lülffing, *Leipziger Frühdrucker* (Leipzig 1959).

¹¹³ Vgl. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 6 (1934), S. 558 Nr. 6791 (*Pro Marcello*) und ebda., S. 554-555 Nr. 6782 (*In Catilinam I*), beide um 1495, s. auch G. Bauch, *Leipziger Frühhumanismus* (s.o. A. 7), S. 26-27. P. Niavis ist der Verfasser des berühmten Gesprächsbüchleins *Latinum ydeoma ...*, s. dazu G. Streckenbach, *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch* 6 (1970), 152-191 und 7 (1971), 187-251; s. auch 10 (1974), 232-270.

¹¹⁴ Auch P. Eolicus, nach G. Bauch, *Leipziger Frühhumanismus* (s.o. A. 7), S. 49-50 vielleicht Petrus Notker de Windelsheim; zu seiner Ausgabe der ersten *Philippica* s. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 6 (1934), S. 562 Nr. 6798 (um 1495).

¹¹⁵ *Pro Cn. Pompeio* (s.a., ca. 1497-1498, vgl. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 6 (1934), S. 552 Nr. 6776); zu Probst s. G. Bauch, *Leipziger Frühhumanismus* (s.o. A. 7), S. 29; S. 72; S. 170-173 u.ö., auch O. Herding (ed.), *Adolescentia* (s.o. A. 29), S. 21-23. Zu anderen Cicero pflegenden Humanisten in Leipzig s. G. Bauch, *Leipziger Frühhumanismus*, passim, z.B. (S. 27-28) zur Lehrtätigkeit des Friedrich von Kitscher, der 1492 aus Italien zurückgekehrt Ciceros *Paradoxa* edierte und Cicero als Philosophen und gewandten Stilisten empfahl und (vor allem S. 172-183) zu Celtis' Schüler Johannes Rhagius Aesticampus. F. L. A. Schweiger, *Handbuch der classischen Bibliographie I/II* (Leipzig 1830-1834), II, S. 136 und S. 141 verzeichnet einige Ausgaben mit Angabe der Verleger, aber nicht der Herausgeber: *Pro Archia* sine anno und 1509 J. Thanner; 1514, 1515 und 1518 Wolfgangus Monacensis (= Stoeckel); 1521 M. Lotter d.Ä.; *De lege Manilia* sine anno J. Thanner, sine anno, 1513 W. Monacensis, 1521 M. Lotter d.Ä.

¹¹⁶ *Pro rege Deiotaro* 1515; 1518; *Pro Flacco* 1516; *In Pisonem* 1516; *Pro Marcello* 1516; *Pro Ligario* 1516; 1521; *Pro Milone* 1521, alle bei Melchior Lotter d.Ä.; *Pro Milone* 1517 (Wolfgang Stoeckel); bei den letzten fünf Ausgaben ist mir nicht sicher, wer sie ediert hat, s. auch A. 115. G. Coellius gibt *Pro Ligario* auch 1522 noch einmal heraus (bei N. Faber). "In orationem Ciceronis pro T. Annio Milone dictata et ex ore praelegentis Hermanni Tulichii excepta" (Wittenberg 1529-1532) finden sich in der von St. Riccius (Reich) herausgegebenen Sammlung *In selectiores M. T. Ciceronis ... enarrationes I/II*

Wien, Celtis' späterer Wirkungsstätte¹¹⁸, schließlich auch in Köln¹¹⁹ und Wittenberg¹²⁰. Doch Erläuterungen veröffentlichten erst 1528 in Köln Bartholomäus Latomus, in Arel (Arlon, Aarlen) gebürtig, der sich wie kaum ein anderer um die Kommentierung der Reden Ciceros bemühte und auch das Lob der "eloquentia" verkündete¹²¹, 1529 in Hagenau Christophorus Hegendorffinus, der nach seinem Studium in Leipzig zunächst auch dort lehrte¹²², und 1530 in Straßburg Martin Boler¹²³; und auch die Vorlesungen, die Philipp Melanchthon seit 1525 in Wittenberg über Reden Ciceros hielt — schon in Tübingen hatte er über Cicero gelesen — fanden seit 1529 in gedruckten Kommentaren ihren Niederschlag (in Wittenberg und Hagenau verlegt)¹²⁴. Die Eigenart der Erklärungen Melanchthons, die Vielfalt seines Wirkens und die große Zahl seiner Schüler, die sich über ganz Deutschland ergossen und von denen viele Kommentare zu Ciceroreden verfaßten, können hier ebenso wenig gewürdigt werden¹²⁵ wie der Einfluß, den Johannes Sturm

(Leipzig 1568-1574) II, S. 1-77; zu H. Tulich (1486-1540) s. W. Görges et al., *Geschichte des Johanneums zu Lüneburg* (Lüneburg 1907), S. 8-11.

¹¹⁷ Der *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* weist auf eine Krakauer Ausgabe hin, die ins sechzehnte Jahrhundert gehört (6 [1934], S. 559); *Pro Ligario*; außerdem sind dort nach F. L. A. Schweiger *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 115) Ausgaben der Reden *Pro Cn. Pompeio magno* (1507: S. 141) und *Pro Marcello* zusammen mit *Pro Ligario* (1528: S. 142) erschienen, ferner durch den jüngeren Rudolf Agricola besorgt Ausgaben der Reden *Pro Archia* und *Pro rege Deiotaro* (1518); zu Rudolf Agricola (1490-1521) s. G. Bauch, *Rudolphus Agricola Junior* (Schulpr. Breslau 1892).

¹¹⁸ *Pro Archia* 1518 (Herausgeber: U. Fabri, vgl. J. Ritter von Aschbach et al., *Geschichte der Wiener Universität I/III* (und Nachträge) [Wien 1865-1898], II, S. 312-315); ebda, S. 319-326 zu Philipp Gundel, der 1522 die Reden *Pro lege Manilia* und *Pro Milone* herausgab; s. zu beiden auch G. Bauch, *Die Reception des Humanismus in Wien* (Breslau 1903).

¹¹⁹ Vgl. abgesehen von einem sehr frühen Druck (*In Catilinam orationes*, um 1474, s. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 6 [1934], S. 553 Nr. 6777) *Orationes Antonianae sive Philippicae* 1522.

¹²⁰ *Pro Marcello* s.a. (vgl. F. L. A. Schweiger *loc. cit.* [s.o. A. 115], S. 142).

¹²¹ Die kommentierten Ausgaben verzeichnet L. Bakelants, "Bartholomaeus Latomus V", *Bibliotheca Belgica* 232-238 (Brüssel 1965-1966), die Sammelkommentare ebda. VI 239-240 (Brüssel 1967). Die *Oratio de laudibus eloquentiae et Ciceronis* ist oft abgedruckt worden, z.B. zu Beginn der Sammelkommentare zu Ciceros Reden Basel 1553 und Lyon 1554 (jeweils ohne Seitenzählung).

¹²² *In Actiones Verrinas, et in Topica M. Ciceronis, adnotatiunculae ...* (Hagenau 1529); zu Ch. Hegendorffinus (1500-1540) s. H. Grimm, *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 8 (1969), S. 227-228, und F. Bierlaire, in P. G. Bietenholz-Th. B. Deutscher (eds.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, 2 (Toronto 1986), S. 171-172.

¹²³ *Scholia in orationem M. T. Ciceronis pro A. Licinio Archia poeta*, vgl. J. Benzing, "Christian Egenolff ...", *Das Antiquariat* 10 (1954), 92.

¹²⁴ Melanchthons Kommentare sind bequem zusammengefaßt in der Ausgabe seiner Werke (s.o. A. 24), 16 (1850), S. 889-1300.

¹²⁵ Zur Melanchthonforschung bis 1970 s. W. Hammer, *Die Melanchthonforschung im Wandel der Jahrhunderte I/III* (Gütersloh 1967-1981).

durch seine Ausgaben, seine Kommentare und vor allem durch sein Eintreten für die Lektüre und Nachahmung Ciceros auszuüben vergönnt war¹²⁶.

Es sei abschließend nur der Blick auf drei sehr verschiedenartige Persönlichkeiten geworfen, einen Melanchthonschüler, der als wackerer Schulrektor in Lüneburg eine beachtliche Zahl von Kommentaren für die Schule verfaßte und dadurch eine Vorstellung davon geben kann, welche Rolle die Lektüre der Ciceroreden im Schulunterricht spielte, zweitens einen Schüler Sturms, der ihm auch als Rektor der Akademie in Straßburg folgte und der am Ende des Jahrhunderts den Reichtum der Reden Ciceros für die Praxis systematisch zu erschließen suchte, und schließlich einen philosophisch geschulten Theoretiker, der die Rolle, die Ciceros Reden bei der Ausbildung spielen sollten, präzise festlegte.

Albertus Lenicerus aus Herford war nach seinem Studium in Wittenberg in Herford und Wittenberg tätig und wurde schließlich Rektor in Lüneburg, wo vor ihm schon H. Tulichius gewirkt hatte¹²⁷. Er empfiehlt für die Lektüre eine bestimmte Reihenfolge der Reden und vor allem ein planmäßiges Vorgehen, um den größten Gewinn aus der Lektüre zu ziehen¹²⁸. Da alle Studien Kirche und Staat nützen sollen, ist es Aufgabe derer, "qui in studiis literarum versantur", sich um die "cognitio ... rerum bonarum et vitae humanae utilium" verbunden mit Urteilsfähigkeit und um die "dicendi facultas" zu bemühen, die den Einzelnen in den Stand setzt zu verstehen und auch zu belehren; beides vermag die Lektüre Ciceros zu vermitteln¹²⁹. Entsprechend sind Lenicers Erläuterungen vielseitig, d.h. sie beschränken sich nicht auf Hinweise zu rhetorischen Figuren oder die stilistische Gestaltung, sondern gehen auch auf moralische Probleme ein; dabei fehlen simple Mahnungen zum Verhalten in der Schule und gegenüber Lehrern nicht, auch nicht sehr äußerliche Bemerkungen. So heißt es im Kommentar zu *Pro Archia* zu "praetextatus" (§ 5): "Non fuit tanta levitas in vestitu ut nunc est; in

¹²⁶ Vgl. J. Rott, "Bibliographie des œuvres imprimées du recteur strasbourgeois Jean Sturm (1507-1589)", in: *Actes du 95^e Congrès national des sociétés savantes* (Reims 1970), *Section de philologie et d'histoire jusqu'à 1610 I, Enseignement et vie intellectuelle (IX^e-XVI^e siècle)*, (Paris 1975), S. 319-404. Einige Literatur zu Sturm nennt B. Singer *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 52), S. 271 A. 1.

¹²⁷ Vgl. o. A. 116; zu A. Lenicer vgl. W. Görge *loc. cit.* (s.o. A. 116), S. 19-21.

¹²⁸ Vgl. die *Prolegomena* zur Rede *Pro Archia* (Wittenberg 1570), deutlicher die *Prolegomena* zu *Pro Marcello* (Wittenberg 1580), ähnlich auch in den *Prolegomena* zu den anderen Reden.

¹²⁹ S. "Epistola dedicatoria" zur Ausgabe der Rede *Pro Archia* (s.o. A. 128), gerichtet an H. Struver; auch das folgende Zitat stammt aus den Erläuterungen zu dieser Rede.

curta tunica saltat Saxo quasi pica". Hier wird Ciceros Formulierung nicht erläutert, weder sachlich noch rhetorisch, stilistisch oder moralisch, sie wird zum Ausgangspunkt allgemeiner Kritik, die nichts mit dem Text zu tun hat. Gewiß ließen auch frühere Kommentatoren deutlich werden, daß sie der Praxis dienen wollten und bemüht waren, Ciceros Vorgehen so zu erläutern, daß der Leser oder Schüler aus den Bemerkungen zu den einzelnen Argumentationen, Figuren, Formulierungen oder Exempla oder zum Aufbau einer größeren Einheit unmittelbar umsetzbare und anwendbare Lehren ziehen konnte; sie ließen auch keinen Zweifel an ihrem moralischen Verantwortungsbewußtsein. Doch hier liefert Cicero gleichsam nur das Stichwort für ganz allgemeine Erwägungen, die im übrigen reichlich banal sind. Sie sind weit entfernt von den hehren Zielsetzungen in Lenicers Einleitung, sie sind noch weiter entfernt von den anspruchsvollen Versuchen vieler italienischer, aber auch mancher deutscher Humanisten, Ciceros Bildungsideale wiederzubeleben, und man wird zögern, Lenicers Behauptung zuzustimmen, daß die Musen, von denen schon Wimpfeling sagte, sie hätten die Alpen überschritten, "tandem ad nos pervenerunt et sedem sibi in nostra Saxonia elegerunt"¹³⁰.

Der etwas jüngere Melchior Junius (1545-1604) wurde in dem anderen blühenden Zentrum der Cicerostudien im deutschsprachigen Raum ausgebildet, in Straßburg auf dem Gymnasium und später auf der Akademie Johann Sturms, auf deren Bedeutung hier leider nicht eingegangen werden kann¹³¹. Vielmehr soll der Blick nur auf ein einziges Werk des Junius geworfen werden, in dem er die Versuche der früheren Kommentatoren, aus dem rednerischen Werk Ciceros Regeln und Ratschläge sowie Beispiele für die Praxis bereitzustellen, bis zur letzten Konsequenz fortführt. Es trägt den Titel *Resolutio brevis orationum M. T. Ciceronis secundum causarum genera, orationum partes, materias ... instituta, ut dilatandae atque ampliandae orationis ratio ex ipsius Ciceronis exemplis appareat*¹³². Wie Albrecht v. Eyb Wörter und Wortverbindungen, Phrasen und Sätze sachlich geordnet zusammenstellte, so reiht Junius

¹³⁰ Erläuterung zu *Pro Archia* § 5: "erat Italia tum plena ...".

¹³¹ Vgl. dazu nur A. Schindling, *Humanistische Hochschule und freie Reichsstadt. Gymnasium und Akademie in Straßburg 1538-1621* (Wiesbaden 1977), auch M. U. Chrisman, *Lay Culture Learned Culture* (New Haven 1982) (diese Darstellung ist nicht immer zuverlässig, ebensowenig wie M. U. Chrisman, *Bibliography of Strasbourg Imprints 1480-1599* [New Haven 1982]). Zu M. Junius vgl. A. Schindling, in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 10 (1974), S. 690.

¹³² S.l. 1594, Vorwort datiert in Straßburg 1594.

aus dem gesamten Corpus der Reden Ciceros auf neunhundert Seiten Exempla für alle nur erdenklichen Topoi aller Redeteile in allen Redegattungen sorgfältig gegliedert aneinander, z.B. "confirmationes" im "genus iudiciale" bei einer Anklage auf über fünfzig Seiten (pp. 412-463). Es gibt wohl kein Werk — jedenfalls kenne ich keines — das so vollständig und so unmittelbar die von Cicero gewählten Mittel der Überredung zur Nachahmung — oder soll man sagen zur Wiederverwendung — erschließt, ein eindrucksvolles Zeugnis größten Fleißes und äußerster Gründlichkeit, aber zugleich ein beängstigendes Dokument eines Nützlichkeitsdenkens, das die Reden Ciceros in ihre Bestandteile zerlegt, vielmehr gleichsam völlig auflöst, zertrümmert, ihres Wesens, ihrer Wirkung, ihrer Eigenart beraubt und zum Steinbruch, zur Materialsammlung herabwürdigt. Aus Respekt vor dem Können des Meisters oder aus Furcht, von dem für die "imitatio" verbindlichen Vorbild abzuweichen und vielleicht auch aus Mangel an eigenen Ideen zerstört Junius die klar erdachten und geschickt ausgeführten Schöpfungen eben dieses Vorbildes, um aus dessen Trümmern nicht nur handgreifliches Anschauungsmaterial für die Möglichkeiten der Nachahmung zu gewinnen, sondern Bausteine, die ohne eigene Neubearbeitung unmittelbar in einem neuen Kontext wieder verwendet werden können. Man mag das praxisnah nennen, und man wird dem Autor weder eine enge Vertrautheit mit der Rhetorik und deren Anforderungen noch Einfühlungsvermögen in die Methoden Ciceros absprechen; und doch läßt sich schwerlich eine Form des Cicerostudiums vorstellen, die dessen Werk rücksichtsloser ausbeutet und zugleich von ihm selbst, von Ciceros Werk, von Ciceros Schöpfungen weiter wegführt.

Kaum weniger beängstigend sind die Vorschläge des in Wittenberg, Leipzig und Heidelberg ausgebildeten, jung verstorbenen Philosophen und Theologen Bartholomäus Keckermann¹³³. Früh schon warnten die deutschen Humanisten, wie oben gezeigt worden ist, vor Umwegen bei der Ausbildung und fordern, auf Überflüssiges zu verzichten, allein das Wesentliche zu beachten, ein Ziel zu bestimmen und eine überlegte Reihenfolge zu wählen¹³⁴; Titel wie *Compendiaria dialectices ratio*, *Methodus inveniendi medium terminum ...* oder *Ratio studendi*, die in

¹³³ Vgl. W. H. van Zuylen, *Bartholomäus Keckermann. Sein Leben und Wirken*, Diss. ev. theol. Tübingen 1933 (Leipzig 1933); s. ferner J. Staedtke, in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 10 (1974), S. 388-389.

¹³⁴ Vgl. z.B. o. S. 89 zu Agricola, dessen Werk dann doch zu lang schien (s.o. A. 28) oder o. A. 43.

dieser oder ähnlicher Form häufig begegnen, weisen auf derartige Forderungen und Bemühungen, die von einzelnen bis ins letzte Detail ausgearbeitet werden¹³⁵. Keckermann entwickelt nicht nur ein *Systema Rhetoricae* im Rahmen seines *Systema Systematum*, er zeigt in seiner *Introductio ad lectionem Ciceronis* ...¹³⁶ zuerst, “quando ad Ciceronis lectionem accedendum sit, et quibus” und dann, “quomodo Cicero, et eius inprimis orationes legendae, et ad imitationem atque usum adhibendae sint” (p. 7). Erst nach gründlichem Studium von Grammatik, Logik und praktischer Philosophie empfiehlt er die Beschäftigung mit der rhetorischen Theorie und dann mit Reden Ciceros, und zwar zunächst mit den Jugendreden in der Weise, daß man eine von ihnen sorgfältig nach den Regeln analysiert und, so vorbereitet, die anderen dann bei der Lektüre im Kopf zu den Regeln in Beziehung setzt. Kommentare zu lesen wie den des Paulus Manutius oder den des Ramusschülers Thomas Freigius (mit seinen zahlreichen Analysen einzelner Argumentationen) ist überflüssig, ebenso sich mit sachlichen Problemen aufzuhalten, den Zeitumständen oder juristischen Fragen nachzugehen; vielmehr soll die Aufmerksamkeit den *loci communes* gelten, sie soll man zur Hand haben und nach ihnen ordnen, was bei Cicero vorkommt, um auf dieser Basis selbst Reden zu formulieren — und zwar rät Keckermann, vierzehn Reden zu verfassen, ehe der Studierende zur nächsten Stufe übergeht. Für das Ganze, d.h. die Lektüre Ciceros und die vierzehn “orationes ad artificia Ciceronis conformatae” rechnet er sieben bis acht Monate¹³⁷. Hier wird keine Zeit verschwendet, um zum Ziel zu gelangen, das allerdings nicht im Verständnis der Reden Ciceros gesehen wird, sondern in der Ausbildung der eigenen Fähigkeiten. Wieder ist die Lektüre der Ciceroreden Mittel zum Zweck; und wie Junius sie zum Arsenal passender Argumente und Phrasen machte, so läßt Keckermann sie zum rasch zu durchheilenden Durchgangsstadium werden, bei dem man nicht zu lange verweilen, dem man aber doch möglichst viel für die eigene Redefähigkeit abgewinnen soll.

Die Kürze der Zeit hat nicht mehr erlaubt, als nur die Anfänge der

¹³⁵ *Compendiaria* ...: Ph. Melanchthon (Leipzig 1520, abgedruckt in: *Opera* [s.o. A. 124], 20, S. [709-] 711-764); *Methodus* ...: Ch. Cornerus (Basel s.a., Widmung: Frankfurt Oder 1556); *Ratio* ...: P. Eber (Wittenberg 1565), zusammen mit J. Garcaeus' *Harmonia de ratione institutionis scholasticae*, einem Werk, das wie kaum ein anderes die Planmäßigkeit der Erziehung unterstreicht.

¹³⁶ *Systema Rhetoricae* (Hanau 1608); *Systema Systematum*, postum ediert Genf 1613 (ebenso die *Opera omnia* ebda. 1614); *Introductio* ... (Hanau 1610).

¹³⁷ *Introductio* ... (s.o. A. 136), S. 22-25.

Erläuterung ciceronischer Reden im deutschsprachigen Raum etwas genauer anzusehen und einige Beispiele der Beschäftigung mit diesen Reden vom Ende des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts im Vergleich danebenzustellen. Auf viele Fragen konnte dabei nicht eingegangen werden, etwa für welche Schichten die Kommentare verfaßt wurden, wie weit auch die jungen Adligen und Fürstensöhne durch sie angesprochen werden sollten, welche anderen Werke antiker Autoren in der Frühzeit des deutschen Humanismus ediert oder kommentiert wurden, welche Humanisten im deutschsprachigen Raum Ciceros Schriften keine oder nur geringe Aufmerksamkeit schenkten.

Versucht man im Rückblick in wenigen Sätzen ein Ergebnis unserer Beobachtungen zur Beschäftigung der Humanisten im deutschsprachigen Raum mit den Reden Ciceros zu formulieren, so wird man zunächst festhalten können, daß sich auch in diesem Bereich zeigt, daß die Entwicklung in Deutschland entscheidend durch Einflüsse von außen bestimmt worden ist, zunächst durch die Tätigkeit einiger Ausländer in Deutschland, dann durch die Studienaufenthalte zahlreicher Deutscher in Italien, weiter durch die Lehre und später auch die gedruckten Schriften des Friesen Rudolf Agricola und andererseits durch Anregungen, die von der Universität in Krakau ausgingen, schließlich durch das Wirken mehrerer anderer Gelehrter aus den westlichen Nachbarländern, D. Erasmus, B. Latomus und P. Ramus, die übergangen werden mußten.

Überall im deutschsprachigen Raum wurden die Reden Ciceros, so hat sich gezeigt, seit dem Ende des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts gelesen und allmählich auch erläutert, aber nicht um ihrer selbst willen, nicht um sie als Reden zu verstehen oder um Ciceros Werk zu würdigen, sondern um sie sehr unmittelbar für eigene Zwecke nutzbar zu machen, um ihren Inhalt und ihre Formen für die Praxis der Lehrenden und Lernenden, der Schreibenden und der Redenden auszubeuten, ihre stilistischen Figuren — ohne daß Cicero zum allein akzeptablen Vorbild gemacht würde — ihre Schlüsse, ihre Topoi, ihre Exempla, ihre allgemeinen Reflexionen. Zugleich spürt man schon früh ein Bemühen, sich nicht mit überflüssigem Ballast zu beschweren, sich auf das Notwendigste zu beschränken, jeden Umweg zu vermeiden, mit geringstem Aufwand in kürzester Zeit mit größtmöglicher Bereicherung des Einzelnen das Ziel zu erreichen, nämlich die eigenen Kräfte zu stärken, um Staat und Kirche in Wort und Schrift wirkungsvoll zu dienen. Deutlicher und einseitiger als in anderen Ländern wird Cicero im deutschsprachigen Raum die Rolle des Schulautors zugewiesen, dessen Reden nicht als

Meisterwerke der rhetorischen Kunst gewürdigt werden, sondern gleichsam als Steinbrüche das Material für oft sehr elementare Unterweisung liefern müssen, die von Gründlichkeit, aber auch Pedanterie und Phantasielosigkeit geprägt ist. An diese Tradition anknüpfend ist die Beschäftigung mit den Reden Ciceros im deutschsprachigen Raum für Jahrhunderte durch die Bedürfnisse der Schulstube geprägt geblieben.

Seminar für klassische Philologie
der Georg-August-Universität,
Göttingen.

Harry VREDEVELD

TOWARDS A DEFINITIVE EDITION OF ERASMUS' POETRY

A valuable piece of pioneering scholarship, Cornelis Reedijk's published dissertation *The Poems of Desiderius Erasmus* (Leiden, 1956) represents a great leap towards a definitive edition of Erasmus' poetry, not the definitive edition itself. It is the work of a young scholar whose enthusiasm far outstripped his experience and who thus deserves Propertius' praise: *quod si deficiant vires, audacia certe / laus erit: in magnis et voluisse sat est*. Along with the gold, of which there is indeed much in his book, there is also much dross. Misprints and misunderstandings, injudicious emendations and unrecognized corruptions abound. Substantive variants, even from authorized editions, are not infrequently neglected, while minor orthographic variants, even from unauthorized reprints, are repeatedly, if inconsistently, included in the critical apparatus. In matters of orthography Dr. Reedijk (unlike his avowed model, P. S. Allen) has allowed himself too free a hand. His preference is clearly for the more classical spelling; and though he often uses a manuscript or first authorized edition as his copy text he generally abandons it for a later edition if it offers the orthography he wants. At times he changes the spelling on his own, perhaps unconsciously, since he fails to record the change in the critical apparatus.

While the merits of Reedijk's edition have often, and deservedly, been praised in the past three decades, its faults have not gone wholly unnoticed. James Hutton's review of the book (1958) noted "very few misprints in the text": "*omne* for *omnem* in *Carm.* 5,32 and again in 8,7; *Atque* for *Atqui* in 83,144; and *Niteat* for *Niteatque* in 83,238"¹. Jean-Claude Margolin, in a lengthy article on the *Carmen Alpestre* (1965), corrected *proferit* to *proserit* in *Carm.* 83,141². Jozef IJsewijn (1969) and

¹ In *Erasmus*, 11 (1958), 31-34; here, 33-34.

² Jean-Claude Margolin, "Le 'chant alpestre' d'Érasme: poème sur la vieillesse", *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 27 (1965), 60 and 66. Margolin believed he was adopting an emendation originally made without comment by Karl-August Meissinger in

others emended *Simeae* to *simae* in 1,4, with some justification, as I shall explain below³. Wendelin Schmidt-Dengler, reprinting from the Reedijk-edition a number of Erasmus' poems (1975), introduced not only some useful corrections but also some new errors⁴. Thus *lenior* is changed to *leuior* in *Carm.* 1,81; *Te* to *Ne* in 8,73; *Cum* to *Cur* in 14,57; *iudice* (wrongly) to *indice* in 14,206; *portendat* to *portendant* in 21,95; *Faustum* (wrongly) to *Faustus* in 39,28; and *iuret* (wrongly) to *viret* in 45,128. In 1978 W.D. Lebek summarized the changes already proposed for Reedijk's text and offered a number of new emendations and corrections himself. He emends *intentior* to *nitentior* in 5,25; *strenuis* to *strenuus* in 5,32; *vicendus* to *vincendus* in the heading of *Carm.* 8; *iacula* to *iaculo* in 8,69; *Hanc* (wrongly) to *Haec* in 8,102; *properat* to *properant* in 9,4; *verus* to *veris* in 9,75; and *circumdans* (wrongly) to *circumdans* in 19,303. He (in part incorrectly) explains *vetuisse* in 19,146, which Reedijk thought a corruption, and restores *Sydere* in 19,296, which Reedijk unnecessarily and against the meter emended to *Cadere*. He also proposes changes in the punctuation of *Carm.* 5,18; 5,27 (wrongly); 5,30; as well as of 8,31; 14,53-56 (wrongly); 19,299; and 19,361-64⁵. In 1979 Alessandro Perosa and John Sparrow corrected *satis* in *Carm.* 83,187 to *satis est*⁶.

Despite these corrections scholars have on the whole not greatly changed their opinion of Dr. Reedijk's edition. From the earliest reviews to the present his work has been praised as exemplary, admirable, and meticulous, indeed comparable in quality to Allen's edition of Erasmus' correspondence⁷. Small wonder, then, that the editorial committee of

his *Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Zürich, 1942), p. 377; but *proserit* is the form found in all the early editions as well as *BAS LB*; only the *Epigrammata* of March 1518 has the erroneous form *proferit*.

³ Jozef IJsewijn, "Erasmus ex poeta theologus", *Scrinium Erasmianum*, ed. J. Coppens (Leiden, 1969) I, 379, note 12. The same emendation had been made independently by L. Ph. Rank and R. C. Engelberts; see Alfred M. M. Dekker, "Dedekind, Erasmus and Navagero: Three Emendations", *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 28 (1979), 342.

⁴ Wendelin Schmidt-Dengler, in *Erasmus von Rotterdam. Ausgewählte Schriften*, ed. Werner Welzig, II (Darmstadt, 1975).

⁵ W.D. Lebek, "Corrections and Explanations in Twenty-nine Latin Poets of the Renaissance", *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 27 (1978), 310-14.

⁶ In: *Renaissance Latin Verse. An Anthology* (London, 1979), p. 472, note on line 187.

⁷ See for instance Louis Bakelants' review, *Latomus*, 16 (1957), 369: "une édition exemplaire"; Jacques Chomarat, "À propos d'Érasme et de la peinture: une légende?" *Latomus*, 32 (1973), 868, note 1: "sa belle édition"; Wallace K. Ferguson, Introduction to *Collected Works of Erasmus*, XXIII (Toronto, 1978), xviii: "... Reedijk's meticulous edition, which would serve for the poems a function similar to that of Allen's *Opus epistolarum* for the Correspondence"; Clarence H. Miller, Introduction to *The Complete*

the Amsterdam-edition of Erasmus' works (*ASD*) has felt no sense of urgency about a new edition of the poetry. The following discussion seeks to change this perception by demonstrating systematically (though by no means exhaustively) that a new critical edition of Erasmus' poems is a desideratum. Wherever possible I have consulted photocopies of the manuscripts and early prints and have compared them with the texts in the Basel (*BAS*) and Leiden (*LB*) editions and with the twentieth-century reprints by Smith, Hyma, and Ferguson⁸. The purpose of this article, it should be emphasized, is not to correct Dr. Reedijk's edition at every turn, especially in the matter of punctuation, orthography, and variant readings. My textual notes are, however, intended to serve as a stopgap corrective to his work and as prolegomena to the edition that ought eventually to come out of Amsterdam.

1. CARMEN BUCOLICUM

In *Go* (as Reedijk indicates) the heading is written as *Carmen buccolicum*. This spelling which recurs at the end of the poem in *Go* is a medievalism found also in the title of Boccaccio's eclogues and in the Egerton manuscript of Erasmus' poems; see below, on *Carm.* 39,40. Since *Go* is Reedijk's copy text, its orthography should have been retained here.

Scri and *CB* nearly always spell the girl's name as *Galataea*, not *Galatea*, as Reedijk states on pp. 131 and 135 and implies in the critical apparatus to line 35 on p. 137. In *Scri* this spelling is often altered by a later hand to *Galatea*, as in *LB*.

1,4. Reedijk's explanation of *simeae* (*Go*) as "an incorrect spelling for the Greek name Simias" exchanges one problem for another. Meaning was restored to the line when J. IJsewijn and others noted the parallel to Vergil, *Buc.* 10,7, and proposed to emend *simeae* to *simae*. This emendation is unnecessary. The form *simeae* is in fact a medieval variant

Works of St. Thomas More, III,2, *Latin Poems* (New Haven, 1984), 40, note 4: "Reedijk's admirable edition".

⁸ Preserved Smith, *Erasmus. A Study of His Life, Ideals and Place in History* (1923; rpt. New York, 1962); Albert Hyma, *The Youth of Erasmus*, University of Michigan Publications, History and Political Science, 10 (Ann Arbor, 1930); and Wallace K. Ferguson, ed., *Erasmi Opuscula. A Supplement to the Opera Omnia* (The Hague, 1933).

At this point I should like to express my gratitude to Professors Jozef IJsewijn and Clarence H. Miller who have kindly commented on the manuscript and offered valuable suggestions for its improvement.

of *simae*, being found as early as the ninth and as late as the fifteenth century in manuscripts and incunabula of Servius and Vergil⁹.

1,7. For *Vel* (*Go*) we find *Nec* in *Scri CB LB*.

1,19-20. Beside line 19, in the left margin of *Go*, there is a gloss: *secum loquitur*. In the right margin of *Go*, beside lines 19-20, we read: *Amantium instabilitas*.

1,21-22. In the text as now punctuated the infinitive *certasse* (21) is left hovering in midair. Are we to supply "licebit" as in line 20? Or something like "oportebit" as Schmidt-Dengler seems to think?¹⁰ Neither: *certasse* depends on *licet* in line 22. The clause *quid tum si vertice Ciclops / Sidera sublimi feriat?* (21-22) must be an interjection. Compare Vergil, *Buc.* 10,37-40:

certe siue mihi Phyllis siue esset Amyntas,
seu quicumque furor (quid tum, si fuscus Amyntas?
et nigrae violae sunt et vaccinia nigra),
mecum inter salices lenta sub vite iaceret.

In order to clarify the grammatical structure of the sentence the interjection *quid* — *feriat?* should be placed within parentheses; *licet* (lower case of course, as in *Go Scri CB LB*) should be followed by a comma (*Hyma*; *Go* has a virgule here).

1,28. For *lenia* (*Go Scri CB LB*) read *leuia* — a correction first made by Alardus of Amsterdam, in the *Errata* on fol. H3^r of *CB*. The young swain is boasting to Gunifolda that he — unlike his shaggy rival — is smooth-faced. Here Erasmus is imitating Tibullus 1,8,31-32: *carior est auro iuuenis cui leuia fulgent / ora nec amplexus aspera barba terit*. The same correction should be made, *mutatis mutandis*, in lines 81 and 85 of the poem.

1,30. In *Go* a marginal note (partly lost because of cropping) explains: *iterum rela<bi>tur a cept<o>*.

1,35. In the apparatus criticus Reedijk states that *Scri CB LB* read *externum* for *Eternum* [sc. *vale*]. In fact they have the form *Extremum*.

1,38. *Thetidos* (*Go*) is a medievalism for the classical *Tethyos* (= Ovid, *Fast.* 5,168; Lucan 1,414; Statius, *Theb.* 4,388; *Ach.* 1,541). The reading *Thetidos* (for *Tethyos*) is found in a manuscript of Claudian, *Carm.* 1,35 (ed. Th. Birt); and in Galterus de Castellione, *Alexandreis* 7,9

⁹ See my: "*Simeae capellae*: A Note on the Text of Erasmus *Carm.* 1,4", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 33 (1984), 103-05.

¹⁰ On p. 217 Schmidt-Dengler translates: "Und doch wirst du streiten müssen!"

(ed. F. A. W. Mueldener; not in M. L. Colker's edition, Padua 1978): *Iamque vaporantem fumabat Thetidos vnda*. Alardus of Amsterdam reports that his manuscript of the poem read *Thetydis*; on fol. B1^r of *CB* (misquoted by Reedijk, p. 133) he says: *scriptum erat sed mendose, Thetydis interea*. Since this form confuses the genitive of *Thētis* (*Thētidis* or *Thētidos*) with the genitive of *Tēthys* (*Tēthyos*) Alardus emended it to the nominative *Tethys* (not *Thetis*, as Reedijk tells us on p. 137). *Scri* (pace Reedijk) also reads *Tethys*; only *LB* reads *Thetis*. Alardus' emendation of the medievalism, while plausible, is nevertheless incorrect, and Reedijk has done well to resist it. "If we may assume", he notes, "that 'Titonis' was intended as an adjective in the sense of 'Tithonia' there is no need for any alteration, 'Thetidos' standing for 'Oceani'". We should therefore, with Reedijk, retain the form *Thetidos* but understand it to mean *Tethys*¹¹.

1,38. The reading *Titonis* appears to be a scribal error for the adjective *Titonia* (*Tithonia*). Compare Vergil, *Aen.* 8,384, where the phrase *Tithonia ... coniunx* occurs in the same metrical position as in Erasmus' line: *te potuit lacrimis Tithonia flectere coniunx*. See also Ovid, *Fast.* 3,403, and Silius, *Pun.* 5,25.

1,50. The Greek accusative ending *-on* in *Rosphamon* (*Go*) is, for metrical reasons, matched here by that in *Pamphilon* (*Scri CB LB*, instead of the expected *Pamphilum*). This ought to be noted in the apparatus.

1,52. In the margin we read *drales* in *Go*, and *Damon* in *Scri CB*.

1,55. In the margin *Scri* notes *Pamph.*, while *CB* prints *Pamphilus*.

1,64. Reedijk's spelling *cythera* (so too: *Hyma*) misconstrues an abbreviation in the Gouda manuscript. *Go* (like *Scri CB LB*) reads *cythara*, abbreviated as *cyth'a*.

1,70. *vultus* (*Scri CB LB Hyma*) should be changed to *voltus* (*Go*). Note that lines 26 and 75 in Reedijk's text both have *voltu*, as in *Go*.

1,72. For *Diana* (*Scri CB LB*) read *Dyana*, as in *Go* (there with lower case initial letter).

1,74. Instead of *Phebi ... Pheben* (*Go*) we find *Phaeben ... Phaebi* in *Scri* (not, as Reedijk reports, *Phoeben ... Phoebi*; the latter is found only in *CB LB*).

1,76. For *Cetera* (*CB*) read *Caetera*, as in *Go Scri LB*. This sort of

¹¹ In other words: we should not translate the phrase *Thetidos ... ab aequore* as "von der Fläche der Thetis" (Schmidt-Dengler, p. 217) but rather as: "from the surface of Tethys [or: the ocean]".

witting or unwitting change is very common in Dr. Reedijk's edition, but is only rarely reported. Thus — to cite a few examples — Reedijk writes *felicius* for *faelicius* in 8,119; *spes* for *spaes* in 11,21; *cepit* for *caepit* in 21,35; *cepere* for *caepere* in 21,165; *cepisse* for *caepisse* in 21,171; *cetera* for *caetera* in 21, 308. At other times he changes *e* to *ae*: *querenda* to *quaerenda* in 25,67; *Preceptor* to *Praeceptor* in 47,13; *Eternitas* to *Aeternitas* in 47,14; *celi* to *caeli* in 47,15; *leuam* to *laeuam* in 131,12. Especially frequent are the instances where *ae* of the copy text is altered to *oe*, as for example in 6,1 (*caelicam*); 6,18 (*phaebus*); 6,39 (*Maestae*); 8,19 (*Craeso*); 9,28 (*Caepere*); and 9,31 (*amaena*). Sometimes, it is true, this change is made in *Scri* by a later hand (that is to say, by the copy-editor of the Leiden-edition), but Reedijk notes this only sporadically.

1,81. The reading *caro lenior* (*Go Hyma*) cannot be correct. Read *caro leuior* (so also *Scri CB LB Schmidt-Dengler*). Compare Ovid, *Met.* 13,792 (Polyphemus' description of Galatea): *Leuior adsiduo detritis aequore conchis*; and see above, on line 28.

1,85. For *genas lenisque* read *genas leuisque* (cf. *Scri CB LB* which have *genasque leuisque*). Compare Nemesianus, *Ecl.* 2,17 *genas leues*, and Claudian, *Carm.* 18,341 *leuesue genae*; and see above, on line 28.

1,95. Beside *choreas* there is a marginal gloss in *Go*: *vel coronas*.

1,101. Line 101 belongs with the preceding sentence; *Gunifoldam* (100) is the object of both *sector* and *voco*. The full stop (*Go*) at the end of line 100 should therefore be eliminated (*Scri CB LB* have a comma here). After *voco* (101) put a colon (*Go*) and after *vocantem* a full stop (*Go*). Erasmus is adapting Ovid, *Met.* 3,382 (the Echo-story): *Voce "Veni!" magna clamat: vocat illa vocantem*.

1,102. Line 102 appears to belong more closely to the following sentence. It leads directly into the comparisons of the beloved's hard-heartedness with the hardness of Mount Ismarus and the cruel viper (cf. Ovid, *Met.* 13,801-04 and Erasmus, *Carm.* 5,19-21). Change the full stop at the end of line 102 to a comma (*Go* has a period at the end of both line 101 and 102; *Scri CB LB* have commas there).

1,104. Why does Reedijk change *aereae* (*Go*) to *aeriae* (*Scri CB LB*)?

2. ELEGIA DE COLLATIONE DOLORIS ET LETICIAE

2,18. After *cahos* either a comma (*Hyma*) or a colon (*Go Ferguson*) is required.

In view of lines 2, 4, 6, and 7 (all: *cura dolorque cadat*) it is clear that Erasmus, in this poem at least, thinks of the phrase *cura dolorque* as a collective phrase governing a singular verb. That is why he can replace it with the pronoun *ille* in lines 9, 11, 12, and 13, and with *furor ille* (*ille furor*) in lines 15 and 16. The plural form of the verb in line 18 *cura dolorque cadant* may therefore be regarded here as a scribal error for *cadat*. (Compare, however, *Carm.* 4,11-12: *Iam quae canicie spergant mea tempora tristi / Praeuenere diem cura dolorque suum*).

3. ELEGIA DE PRAEPOTEENTI VIRTUTE CUPIDINIS PHARETRATI

3,21. *Omnis* is a misprint for *Omnia* (*Go Hyma Ferguson*). Compare lines 19, 35, and 37.

3,23. The two adjectives now modifying *clauae* prevent an effective caesura and produce an unpleasant jingle: *nodosae validae ... clauae*. Here we must suspect a copyist's mistake (an original *o* being misread as an *e* and then written as *e*-caudata) though it is not so easy to determine which of the two adjectives has received the wrong case ending. Shall we read *nodoso validae pro robore clauae* or *nodosae valido pro robore clauae*? For the first possibility compare Ovid, *Met.* 12,349: *Robore nodoso* (the knotted oak, i.e., club); Val. Flacc. 2,534: *validos nodosi roboris ictus*; and 8,298: *naulem nodosi roboris vncum*. Compare also, for the arrangement of adjectives, Vergil, *Aen.* 4,441: *... annoso validam cum robore quercum*. For the second possibility compare especially Statius, *Theb.* 2,619: *pineae nodosae quassabat robora clauae*; Silius, *Pun.* 2,246: *... nodosae pondera clauae*; Politianus, *Syluae* 4,397 (not published until 1491): *... nodosae robore clauae*. Compare also Ovid, *Trist.* 5,12,11: *valido pectus ... robore fultum*; and Val. Flacc. 4,684: *valido ... robore*; and, for the arrangement of adjectives, Erasmus, *Carm.* 21,160: *... imam valido cum turbine abyssum*. The emendation of *validae* to *valido* appears to have the stronger parallels and deserves preference over its alternative.

3,38. Passionate love, says Erasmus in lines 35-38, makes the wise foolish and the sharp-sighted blind, it strikes the eloquent dumb and turns old men into striplings¹². These are familiar commonplaces. But

¹² Schmidt-Dengler, p. 227, in part misunderstands the passage: "Alles wandelt die Liebe, sie macht die Toren zu Weisen, und die blinde Liebe blendet die Augen des Argus. Alles wandelt die Liebe; sie macht den Stummen beredt, und die Greise macht Gegenliebe zu Knaben". In line 38 Erasmus alludes to the medieval commonplace of the *senex amans*.

what are we to make of *amatus amor* in line 38? Schmidt-Dengler believes it means "Gegenliebe", though it is hard to see what Erasmus might have had in mind with "mutual love" or "loved love". The puzzle is solved when we emend *amatus* to *amarus*. The resulting phrase *amarus amor* is found, in the same metrical position, in Venantius Fortunatus, *Carm.* 3,23a,12: [*Agerice sacer*], *inlecebris mundi mundus, lasciuia repellens, / nil cui subripuit carnis amarus amor*¹³. The phrase was popular in medieval and Renaissance literature. See Walther, *Proverbia* 2387: *Carnem deliciis corrumpit, inebriat, inde / Prodit amarus amor, prodit amara lues*; 10775 (24034, 24548, 25547, and 29000): *Heu, qui dixit "amor", melius dixisset "amarum"*. / *Si bene novisset, quam sit amarus amor*; 11058: *amaro ... amor*; 17235 (= Andrelinus, *Hecatodistichon*, 12, published ca. 1510): *Non amor antiquo fuerat, sed amaror, ab euo / Dicendus, cum sit semper amarus amor*; and Landinus, *Xandra* 1,14,6: *si dulcis, dulci cur tot permiscet amara, / dulcia vel qui dat, si sit amarus Amor*.

3.42. Citing *Carm.* 7,8, *Audis nymbriferi flamina saeua Noti* (from a

Compare Hans Walther, *Proverbia sententiaeque Latinitatis medii aevi*, Carmina medii aevi posterioris Latina, 2, 6 vols. (Göttingen, 1963-69), no. 23763a: *Quem puer arripuit, puerum facit esse cupido*; Marullus, *Epigrammata* 1,59,4 ("De Amore"): "vnde puer?" "Pueros quod facit ipse senes".

¹³ Erasmus must have known Venantius' poems in manuscript; a complete printed edition did not appear until almost a century later. There is good evidence for supposing that he did have access to some such manuscript fairly early. The phrase *adamantea claustra* in *Carm.* 3,19 probably derives from Venantius, *Mart.* 1,5: *et Stygis omnipotens adamantina claustra reuellit*. Venantius, *Carm.* 3,9,11, *molliā purpureum pingunt violaria campum*, served as the model for several of Erasmus' lines: *Carm.* 7,3, *Arida purpurei fugiant violaria flores*; 9,83, *Pingit gramineum florum decus vndique campum*; 24,41, *Mollia sanguinei pingunt violaria partus*; and 24,49, *Iam non purpurei pingunt violaria flores*. The unclassical phrase *oceanas ... aquas* in Erasmus, *Carm.* 7,10, is from Venantius, *Carm.* 3,9,4 (3,18,6), in the same metrical position. *Carm.* 9,70, *Exiliunt terris gramina* is paralleled by Venantius, *Carm.* 3,9,15: *seges exilit aruis*. Erasmus, *Carm.* 9,92, *Gramine prata virent, gramina flore nitent* conflates two hemistichs from Venantius: *Carm.* 1,20,12, *florea gemmato gramine prata virent*; and *Carm.* 3,9,34, *vndique fronde nemus, gramina flore fauent*. And Erasmus, *Carm.* 9,96, *Ac apis in flore mella legendo strepit* has as its source Venantius, *Carm.* 3,9,25-26: *apes ... / floribus instrepitans poplite mella rapit*. See also Reedijk's notes on *Carm.* 21,11ff.; 21,131-32; 21,216; 21,290ff.; 21,314; 21,329; and 21,347 for further parallels (all to the famous poem *De pascha*, *Carm.* 3,9).

The wordplay on which the phrase *amarus amor* rests is ancient, remaining popular in later literature. Compare Plautus, *Cistellaria* 68: *amare ... amarum*; Vergil, *Buc.* 3,109-10: *amores / ... amarus*; also Petrarch, *Ecl.* 3,85-86: *amaror, / siue amor*; Walther, *Proverbia*, 6384a: *Dulcis amaror amor*; 22430: *... finis amoris amarus*; 24548: *Qui prius inquit; amor, melius dixisset: amaror*; Mantuanus, *Ecl.* 1,52: *Amor est ... amaror*; Andrelinus, *Liuiā* 4,8,28: *Dulcis amor semper tristis amaror erit*; Erasmus, *Adagia* 4,1,1 (*LB* II, 951 C): *nondum senserunt, quantum amor insit amari*.

different manuscript, *Scri*) Reedijk rightly refuses to correct the unclassical *nymbriferis* in line 42. The word is not, as D. F. S. Thomson assumes, of Erasmus' coinage¹⁴. It is a medieval hybrid, a cross between *imbrifer* and *nimbifer*. See *Novum Glossarium Mediae Latinitatis* (Kopenhagen, 1957ff.), s.v. *nimbrifer*.

4. QUERULA DOLORIS

The complete heading of this poem in *Go* reads: *Elegia erasmi: querula Doloris*. It is apparent from this that *querula* is not a noun as Reedijk apparently thought — it would have had to be spelled *querela* in that case — but an adjective with *Elegia*. The colon after *erasmi* in *Go* serves only to set off the poet's name from the remainder of the title. (Thus the heading of *Carm.* 3 in *Go* is *Elegia erasmi: de praepotenti virtute cupidinis pharetrati*). Read: *Elegia querula doloris*.

5. ODA AMATORIA

Reedijk correctly identifies the meter as "Metrum Pythiambicum primum" (p. 115). When on the same page, however, he declares that he is unable to find an example in classical Latin poetry for this verse form (no. XIV in his listing) he is obviously in error (compare his note on *carm.* 5,23). He must be referring to no. XVI in his list, the metrical pattern of *Carm.* 83.

5,25. Lebek emends *intentior* (*LB*) to *nitentior*. This in truth restores the reading in *Scri*, where the *i* is dotted rather negligently over what is unmistakably an initial *n*.

5,27. After *tenero* Lebek proposes to add a comma. Although that in fact is also the punctuation in *Scri* (not *LB*) this is an error since *tenero* is an adjective with *vere*, not *tibi*. If a comma is to be added it should be put at the caesura, after *sit*.

5,31. *Scri* originally had *cathenis*; this was changed by a later hand to *catenis*, the reading in *LB*.

5,32. James Hutton corrects *omne* to *omnem*; this is in fact the

¹⁴ D. F. S. Thomson, "The Latinity of Erasmus", *Erasmus*, ed. T. A. Dorey (London, 1970), p. 129. The author expresses confidence "that some at least among the following list ... were the children of his inventive brain: ... (In verse) *flammiuomus*, *igniuomus*, *moricanus*, *nymbriferus*, *organon* ('tongue'), *paranymphus*, *plasma*, *plastus*, *sophia*". But these words, with the exception of *moricanus*, are more or less common currency in late classical and Middle Latin literature (see Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*).

reading of *Scri* and *LB*. In the same line Lebek emends *strenuis* (*LB Reedijk*) to *strenuus*. This emendation, indeed, approximates the original reading in *Scri* which is *strennuus*, a fairly common Renaissance spelling. A later hand had changed this to *strenuus*; but as the compositor of *LB* mistook the vocalic mark above the second *u* to signify the dot of an *i*, *LB* printed *strenuis*.

6. AD AMICUM SUUM

Reedijk follows the spelling of *LB* when he writes *choriambicum* in the heading of this ode (and in that of *Carm.* 17); *Scri* spells the word *Coryambicum*. Oddly Reedijk returns to the spelling *Coryambicum* (*Scri*) in the heading of *Carm.* 20, even though *LB* has *Choriambicum*.

6,11. The spelling *glacies* comes from *LB*, not from *Scri* which reads *glaties*.

6,21. A comma is required after *astra*, as in *Scri* and *LB*. Compare Prudentius, *Cath.* 3,5: *astra, solum, mare*. The model for the passage as a whole is Horace, *Carm.* 1,12,15-16: *Qui mare ac terras variisque mundum / Temperat horis*.

6,31. For *improba*, which is in fact Reedijk's emendation, both *Scri* and *LB* have the erroneous form *improla*.

6,35. *campis ... petentibus* is meaningless. Read *campis ... patentibus*. Compare *Carm.* 25,45: *patentibus aruis*.

7. ELEGIA DE MUTABILITATE TEMPORUM. AD AMICUM

7,8. *Scri* originally had *Nothi*; this was changed by a later hand to *Noti*, as in *LB*.

7,13. Since this is a poem of friendship it is probable that the adjective *dulcis* (13) belongs, not with *iuuentus*, but with *amice*. This impression is confirmed in the poem's concluding line: *Carpamus primos, dulcis amice, dies*. The phrase *dulcis amice*, in this position of the hexameter, is also found in Horace, *Epist.* 1,7,12 and Venantius Fortunatus, *Carm.* 7,25,19, and is commonplace in other metrical positions¹⁵.

¹⁵ See Otto Schumann, *Lateinisches Hexameter-Lexikon. Dichterisches Formelgut von Ennius bis zum Archipoeta*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Hilfsmittel 4,2 (Munich, 1980), 155-56.

8. ELEGIA DE PATIENTIA

Lebek has corrected the heading: for *vicendus* read *vincendus*, as in *Scri LB*.

8,2. For *quocumque* read *quocunque* (*Scri LB*). This sort of unadvertised and unnecessary alteration in the Renaissance spelling is all too common in Reedijk's edition. Thus (in part following *LB*) he alters *Tanquam* in line 18; *quicunque* in line 133; *Nunquam* in *Carm.* 14, lines 31, 32, and 154; *quaecunque* in 14,169; *circundata* in 21,214; *quenque* in 23,15; and so forth.

8,5. *Scri* reads *Otyor*, not *Ocyor* (*LB*).

8,7. For *omne* read *omnem* (*Scri LB Hutton*).

8,13. Puzzled by the apparently wrong quantity of the final syllable of *varia* (*Scri LB*), Reedijk emends the word to *varium*. But *varia* is an adjective with *cupido* and should therefore be restored to the text. The final *a* is lengthened here before the masculine caesura. Erasmus (like the medieval poets) is very fond of the device, at least in his early poetry. See *Carm.* 1,82; 2,19. 23; 3,15. 19. 24. 43; 4,3; 7,17; 8,75. 81. 106; 9,6. 29. 32. 50. 66. 88. 96; etc.

8,23. As Reedijk notes, *Scri* originally had *summae*. The letter deleted, however, is not the *e* as Reedijk reports, but the *a*.

8,31. Lebek rightly removes the comma (*LB*) at the end of the line; *Scri* did have a comma there, but it is crossed out, apparently by a later hand.

8,48. *Scri* originally read *Archani que*; this was altered by a later hand to *Archanique*, whence the reading in *LB*.

8,69. Correct *iacula* to *iaculo* (*Scri LB Lebek*).

8,73-74. Schmidt-Dengler correctly emends *Te* to *Ne* in line 73 but fails to follow through on the punctuation. Change the full stop at the end of line 74 to a comma.

8,102. Lebek's proposed emendation of *Hanc* to *Haec* is unnecessary and undesirable. Patience, the commander of the Virtues, would be the first to yield before the storm of Pain (*Cedet prima*, line 101) if the solicitous Prudence (*sedula*, line 102) were not to accompany this leader (*hanc ... ducem*); compare lines 93-94.

8,116. *Scri* originally had *nymbos*; this was altered by a later hand to *nimbos*, as in *LB*.

8,126. *Scri* originally had *anchora*; this was subsequently changed to *ancora*, the reading in *LB*.

8,129. The contraction symbol over the *u* of *ventûm* derives from *LB*, not *Scri*.

9. CERTAMEN ERASMI ATQUE GUIELMI DE TEMPORE VERNALI

9,4. Emend *properat* (*Scri LB*) to *properant* (*Lebek*).

9,8. In his apparatus criticus Reedijk notes that *LB* reads *comam* and implies that *Scri* gives *coma*. In fact *Scri* also has *comam*. This reading — it is a classical construction in which the antecedent is attracted to the relative pronoun and included in the relative clause — should be restored to the text.

9,14. *Scri* originally wrote *Vir*. This was corrected by a later hand to *Ver*, the reading in *LB*.

9,75. Correct *verus* to *veris* (*Scri LB Lebek*).

9,96. In the general introduction (p. 116) Reedijk observes: "Only a few traces of non-classical usage can be pointed out. Whilst employing the gerund instead of the participium coniunctum (Carm. 9,96: *Ac apis in flore mella legendo strepit*) Erasmus relapsed into one of the characteristic solecisms of the barbaric epoch". But this construction, in which the ablative of the gerund replaces the present participle, can also be documented in the classical poets. See for example Prop. 1,1,9: *Milanion nullos fugiendo ... labores / saeuitiam durae contudit Iasidos*; and Vergil, *Aen.* 2,6: *quis italia fando / Myrmidonum ... / temperet a lacrimis*? See further: J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik* (Munich, 1965), II, 379-80.

9,97. The ascription *Guie.* before line 97 is lacking in *Scri*.

10. EPITAPH FOR MARGARETA HONORA

In the *Epigrammata* of 1506/7 and 1518 the poem has a heading not recorded by Reedijk except in translation: *Epitaphium Margaretae honorae* (in the 1518 edition: *HONORAE*).

11. MAGISTRO ENGHELBERTO LEYDENSI

11,13. For Reedijk's *quum* (*cum*), which fits the sense but not the meter, the Gouda manuscript has the abbreviation *qm̃*. Hyma and Ferguson read *quoniam*, which fits the meter but not the sense. We should assume therefore that *qm̃* is a scribal error for *qñ* and emend to *quando*, which happily fits both meter and sense.

12. EPITAPHIUM BERTAE DE HEYEN

12,2-3. Reedijk explains *alma* / *Ossa* with a reference to *Carm.* 29,9ff. where dying is likened to sowing, and burial to planting seed in the ground: the corpse, like the seed, will rise from the dead when the Zephyrs begin to blow again in a new Spring. In the present poem *alma* does not fit that context. *Ossa*, after all, can hardly be termed *alma*, "nourishing", "bountiful". They are *nescia sanguinis* (13,27), *sicca* (29,15), *arida* (116,1). But the adjective in line 2 does not belong with *Ossa* at all: it should read *almae* and belongs with *Bertae*. This is supported by *LB* which reads *almae*, though one will not learn this from Reedijk's apparatus. (I have not seen *Scri* for this poem). The correctness of this reading is further confirmed by *Carm.* 13,5 which evidently rephrases our line: *Bertae tegit ossa beatae*. In both poems, *Carmm.* 12 and 13, Erasmus goes on to explain why these adjectives — *almae* and *beatae* — are justified. Bertha, we read in 12,5-7, was a foster-mother to orphans, a solace to the needy, and a *nutrix* to the hungry. And in 13,21-24 it is said of her that she was

Nutrix ... omnibus ...
Quos dira premebat egestas,
Spes vna dolentibus, vna
Aegris reparatio vitae.

13. ALIUD EPITAPHIUM

13,29. *quibus* does not scan. Read *quís*, as in *LB*.

14. APOLOGIA ERASMI ET CORNELII ADVERSUS BARBAROS

The heading as reprinted by Reedijk contains several errors. (i) Correct *veterem* to *veterum* (*Scri Sil LB*); compare *Carm.* 15, whose heading reads: ... *barbarorum, qui veterum eloquentiam contemnunt*. (ii) *Scri* originally read *Asclepiadaei*; this was changed by a later hand to *Asclepiadei*, the reading of *Sil LB*. (iii) Correct *Glyconicus* to *Glyconius* (*Scri LB*); *Sil* reads *Gliconius*.

14,30. Restore the spelling *incandens* (*Sil Scri*). It is a medieval variant of the classical *incendens* (*LB*)¹⁶.

¹⁶ See *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, s.v. *incandeo*, and Albert Blaise, *Dictionnaire Latin-Français des auteurs du Moyen-Age. Lexicon Latinitatis medii aevi praesertim ad res ecclesiasticas inuestigandas pertinens* (Turnhout, 1975), s.v. *incandeo*.

14,51. Reedijk's critical apparatus gives the impression that the form *dispereat* derives from *Sil*, while *Scri LB* read *disperiat*. In fact *Sil* too has *disperiat*. This spelling, no doubt a medievalism, should be restored to the text. (In the Vulgate and elsewhere the future tenses of the verb are commonly written as *disperiet*, *disperierunt*).

14,53-56. Lebek (p. 312) points out that *qui* is the subject of *Corrodis* (55). He therefore proposes to add a comma after *es* (53), a dash after *qui* (53) and after *malagmatis* (54), an exclamation mark after *medicum* (55), and wants to change the full stop after *necem* (56) to a question mark. This punctuation appears to be based on a wrong reading of the text. The passage does not, in Lebek's words, describe "the man who despises poetry". Rather, it is addressed to Erasmus, the poet who has given up on poetry and refuses to accept it now as the only cure for his depression. Cornelius therefore upbraids him: "Ah, how wretched you are! Can you really be healed if you continue to gnaw at the physician and reject the medicine which alone can restore you to health? You are [in that case] already dead in spirit (*Non viuus*, line 56) and will soon die in body as well (*capiēs necem*)". The lines should be repunctuated as follows:

Eheu quam miser es! Qui tibi congrua
Contemnens reducis dona malagmatis
Corrodis medicum, num medicabere?
Non viuus capies necem.

This is the punctuation found in *LB*, except for line 54 where *LB* has a comma after *malagmatis*. (*Scri* has a comma after *medicum*, a question mark after *medicabere*, and a full stop at the end of the stanza. *Sil* puts a period after *medicum*, a question mark after *medicabere*, but has no further punctuation). The exclamation mark after *es* in line 53 provides a strong caesura in the proper place, after the sixth syllable. Line 56 answers the preceding question; it is a statement, not another question.

14,57. Correct *Cum* to *Cur* (*Scri Sil LB Schmidt-Dengler*).

14,90. Reedijk sporadically takes pains to note the changes made in *Scri* by a later hand, changes which then appear in *LB*. He neglects to note that *Thyle* in line 90 was altered by a copy editor's mark in *Scri* to read *Thule*, the *y* being crossed out and a *u* placed in the margin. (*Sil* also reads *Thyle*; *LB* has *Thule*).

14,93. In *Scri* the spelling of *querens* is changed to *quaerens*, but this change (*pace* Reedijk) does not appear in *LB*.

14,122. Lines 122-24 give some biblical exempla for the power of music: the trumpets which brought down the walls of Jericho (Ios. 6,20) and David's singing to the harp which refreshed Saul when the evil spirit from God came on him (1 Sam. 16,23). Line 124 has caused difficulties. At first sight it appears to be a continuation of the statement in line 123: "and David calmed Saul with his song and the pyre put down its flames". That at any rate is how Schmidt-Dengler understands the verse (p. 251, note 9): "'Scheiterhaufen' ist bloß bildlich für den Zorn Sauls gemeint". That image, however, would be very strained indeed. Anger to be sure is often compared with a flame or fire; but is it likely that a poet should call anger a "funeral pyre"? It should be noted too that David's playing could refresh Saul when the evil spirit from God weighed on him, but could not soothe Saul in his anger (1 Sam. 18,10-11). Erasmus, however, is alluding to a third exemplum from the Old Testament: the song of the three men in the fiery oven (Dan. 3,24-97). Their singing (*carmine*, line 123) caused the fire which was meant to put them to death (*rogus*) to lose its power to burn and so to "put down its flames". Compare the following parallels, all dealing with the Daniel-passages: Sedulius, *Carm. pasch.* 1,205: *flammis / Ardentis fidei restincta est flamma camini*; Dracontius, *De laudib.* 3,172-74: *mox tepuere calores, / frigidus ignis erat, gelidis incendia flammis / mirantur cecidisse*; and Florus Lugd., *Carm.* 9,52: *Vim ... suam oblitus sanctos non laederet ignis*.

It follows from this interpretation that the repeated *Et ... Et* of lines 123 and 124 is correlative ("both ... and"), not copulative ("and ... and"). We should therefore alter the punctuation of this passage. While Reedijk follows *Scri* and *Sil* in having no final punctuation in line 122, we ought instead to adopt *LB*'s use of a comma at the end of this line to separate the first exemplum from the second. Lines 123 and 124, which are linked not only by *et ... et* but also by the shared noun *carmine*, should not be separated by a comma: "through song David soothed Saul and the funeral pyre put down its flames".

14,167. For *ponito* (*Scri LB*) *Sil* gives the erroneous form *ponite*.

14,173. Reedijk adopts the punctuation of *LB* for line 173 and puts a comma at the end of the verse (*Scri* and *Sil* have no punctuation mark there). This, however, makes it appear as if *hactenus* is an adverbial modifier of *inuide*: "you who have until now pursued me with your envy". It is more likely that *hactenus* belongs with line 174: "up to now I have dedicated no poems to God's Temple". Add a period or an exclamation mark after *tuis*, at the caesura of line 173. The vocative *inuide* might well be set off with commas.

14,194. The form *Musam* derives from *Sil. Scri* and *LB* here erroneously write *Musa*.

14,195. Change *Tirynthius* (*LB*) to *Tyrinthius* (*Scri Sil*).

14,209. Read *Virgilium* (*Scri Sil LB*).

14,215. A comma should be added after *pectoris* (*LB*).

14,216. The change in spelling from *reliquiae* (*Sil Scri LB*) to *reliquiae* is gratuitous. Compare Vergil, *Aen.* 8,356: *reliquias veterumque ... monumenta virorum*; Erasmus, *Carm.* 20,27: *reliquum*; etc.

14,221. The alteration of *lethificus* (*Sil Scri LB*) to *letificus* is unnecessary and potentially misleading; is *letificus* now to be understood as *laetificus*? Compare *Carm.* 21,42: *Laetificum ... diem*. Elsewhere Reedijk does not "correct" such spellings; see *Carm.* 19,206 *lethum*; 21,64 and 21,263 *lethi*. The word, in any case, was often spelled with *th* since late antiquity, owing to a supposed connection of *letum* with λήθη.

15. HIERONIMUS LOQUITUR

In the heading of the poem in *Scri* the saint's name appears as *Hieronimum* and, three lines later, as *Hieronimus*. The spelling of *Hieronimum* (but not *Hieronimus*) was altered in *Scri* by a later hand to *Hieronymum*, whence this form in *LB*.

15,5. *corrunt* is a misprint for *currunt* (*Scri LB*).

15,28. For *admoneo* (*LB Scri*) erroneously writes *admone*.

15,33. *stilum* in *Scri* was changed by a later hand to *stylum*, as in *LB* and Reedijk.

15,34. *Ieronimi* in *Scri* was subsequently altered to *Ieronymi*, whence the spelling in *LB*.

16. LIBELLUS LOQUITUR

According to Reedijk's critical apparatus *LB I* is the first text which offers the title *In fronte Enchiridii*. In fact this heading is first found in the *Epigrammata* of 1506/7 and 1518.

16,1. *Scri* writes *conuitia*, misread in *LB VIII* as *comitia*.

At the end of the poem in *Scri* we read: *finis. τέλος*.

17. IN LAUDEM BEATISSIMI GREGORII PAPAE

In the heading to this ode *Scri* originally read *corymbicum*; this was altered by a later hand to *Choriambicum*, whence the spelling in *LB* and

Reedijk; see above, on *Carm.* 6. Reedijk also follows *LB* when he writes *glyconico*; *Scri* had *Gliconico* before this was altered by a later hand to *Glyconico*.

17,3. The comma after *Gregorii* in line 3 should be removed; it is Reedijk's, appearing in neither *Scri* nor *LB*. Line 3 *festā* is not a noun, as Reedijk seems to have thought, but an adjective with *gaudia*.

17,29-30. The last stanza is a doxology giving all glory, laud, and honor to the Trinity: Father, Son (*Patris ... vnico*; cf. *Carm.* 21,31), and Holy Ghost (*Almo ... Pneumati*). After *vnico* in line 29 and after *Pneumati* in line 30 commas are in order. (*Scri* and *LB* have no punctuation after *vnico* but put a colon after *Pneumati*).

18. EPIGRAMMA DE QUATUOR NOUISSIMIS

18,3-4. Erasmus is describing the Four Last Things: Death, Judgment, Hell, and Heaven. Construe lines 3 and 4 as follows: *Iherusalem supernae gaudia luctus ignara, non [habitura] finem, non habitura modum*. *Iherusalem* (*Scri*; in *LB*: *Jerusalem*), modified by *supernae*, is in the genitive case and depends on *Gaudia*. For these reasons Reedijk's comma after *Iherusalem* must be eliminated; it has no basis in *Scri* or *LB* and is ruinous to sense. The comma should instead go after *Gaudia* (as in *LB*; *Scri* has a colon here) in order to separate the two modifiers *ignara* and *habitura*. Schmidt-Dengler has no punctuation after *Iherusalem* and *Gaudia*.

19. PAEAN DIUAE MARIAE

19,53. *olymp̄i* in *Scri* was changed by a later hand to *olympi*, the spelling in *LB*.

19,65. *Ipse* is Reedijk's emendation for *Ipsa* (*Scri LB*). But *Ipsa*, which belongs with *Cornua Phaebe*s of the preceding verse, is the correct reading. The comma after *Phaebe*s (*Scri* and *LB* have a period here) should be dropped and inserted instead after *Ipsa*.

19,66. A comma is needed after *prementem*, as in *LB*; *Scri* has a colon there.

19,74. As Reedijk notes, *Scri* writes *Sybillae*; this was a common Renaissance spelling. A later hand changed this to *Sibyllae*, whence the form in *LB* and Reedijk.

At the end of line 74 we need a comma; that indeed is the punctuation of *LB* (*Scri* writes a colon here). It follows from this punctuation that

Sybillae is not a genitive singular but a plural nominative. For the plural in this context compare Erasmus, *Paean Virgini Matri* (LB V, 1229 F): ... *te Phoebi tripodes, te Sibyllarum folia portendebant. Scripta* (75) is in apposition to *cantant* ... *Sybillae*: "The Delian Sibylls prophesied in clear words that you would be the mother of the eternal King, prophecies they rashly entrusted in writing to [wrote down on] perishable (palm) leaves".

19,92. Erasmus is alluding to one of the Old-Testament prefigurations of the Virgin Birth, the story of the dewy fleece on the dry ground (Iud. 6,36-38). As the fleece had been put on the ground (*in area*), not on armor or weapons, Reedijk emended *armis* (*Scri LB*) in line 92 to *areis*. This emendation, while metrically possible (if we assume synizesis), is paleographically unlikely. Read instead: *Vellus in aruis*. For the phrase *siccis ... aruis* see Lucan 6,377.

19,94. *Scri* originally wrote *iudeis*; a later hand changed this to *judaeis*, whence the spelling in *LB*.

19,146-48. Lebek (p. 313), refuting Reedijk's notion that *vetuisse* in line 146 is "doubtlessly a corruption", explains that *contendit* (147) means "contended" (i.e., "asserted") and governs an accusative-infinitive construction. The infinitives of this construction, he believes, are *vetuisse* and *succedere*; the "absence of the pronominal subjects both of *vetuisse* and *succedere*" he explains as being common in cases where "the accusatives are easily supplied from the context". Thus Lebek arrives at the following translation of the passage: Satan "contended with admirable craft that he (God) had forbidden ... [Adam and Eve] to enter heaven which (therefore) was miserably lost"; or, in an alternate translation: "contended that he (God) with admirable craft had forbidden". This too is a misunderstanding. Let us note the following. (i) The phrase *mira / Arte* cannot be clearly accounted for in Lebek's interpretation. Does it apply to Satan or to God? (ii) His reading forces us to supply both an accusative subject for *vetuisse* — "God" — and an accusative object for *succedere* — "them", i.e., Adam and Eve — which are not at all "easily supplied from the context". (iii) It is difficult to see what Satan is accomplishing by telling Adam and Eve, who had never heard anything of the sort before, that God had forbidden them to enter heaven. And if God had never made them such a promise, how could heaven be "miserably lost"¹⁷? We are clearly on a false track here and

¹⁷ Nicolaas van der Blom, "On a Verse of Erasmus", *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 1 (1981), 153, note 4 d) also interprets the lines in this way: "In its rage the

must reorient ourselves by studying the context of the passage. The rebellious Satan has been vanquished and he and all his minions have been driven out of heaven (105-08). To replace the loss God created man (109-16) and caused him to live in Paradise (117-32), giving him dominion over all things except the Tree of Knowledge (133-44). Now Satan, in his consuming envy (*livor*) for man's exalted status (*tantos ... honores*), strives (*contendit*) with all his craft (*mira arte*; cf. 197 *Arte subreptus*) to prevent (*vetuisse*) their attaining to that heaven (*succedere caelo*) which he himself had so wretchedly lost (*male perditio*). The verb *contendit*, used here in the sense of "strives", governs the infinitive *vetuisse* (a past form which for metrical reasons is used for a present — a very common poetic usage). The infinitive *vetuisse* in turn governs *succedere caelo*. For the latter construction compare especially Statius, *Ach.* 1,1-3 (a passage from which Erasmus also borrowed a hemistich in *Carm.* 3,26): *Magnanimum Aeaciden formidatamque Tonanti / progeniem et patrio vetitam succedere caelo, / diua, refer.*

19,177-86. The semicolon after *peremit* in line 180 (*Scri* and *LB* have a period here) should be changed to a comma since the thought runs on into the next stanza. *Dispari* (181), an ablative with *ruina* (179), contrasts with *simili* (179). The meaning of the passage is this. Sin (*nox*) has brought ruin to both heaven and earth: to the latter (*hanc*) through man's fall, to the former (*illud*) through Lucifer's pride. In this respect man's sin and Satan's are similar, for each brought death into creation. From another perspective, however, the two sins are vastly different (*ruina ... / ... / Dispari longe*). As Reedijk correctly explains: "Erasmus distinguishes between the fall of Man (*hic* [181] who was seduced into sinning and can therefore be redeemed, and the guiltiness of Satan (*alter* [183]) who acted without provocation and whose punishment shall therefore be eternal".

This is as far as Reedijk could go in understanding these lines. He continues: "The passage is rendered the more obscure in *Scri* and *LB* where a colon and a comma respectively are placed after *venenum* while no punctuation occurs between *Ambitus* and *alter*". In point of fact, it is Reedijk's punctuation which makes the passage obscure. We should

jealous serpent did not claim that man had been given so great and honoring task, viz. that he should take charge of the earth. The serpent pretended that God with amazing guile had forbidden man to eat the fruits of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil and thereby to ascend to heaven, which for man, if he was to stick to this prohibition, would be woefully lost".

(with *LB*) put a comma after *venenum* (182) and drop the comma after *Ambitus* (183). *Ambitus* here means the sin of Pride. Its long final syllable indicates that it is the genitive object of *Auctor* in line 184. Satan became the father of sinful pride (*auctor ambitus iniqui*), and this of his own free will (*stimulante nullo*). Man, by contrast, was seduced; he ate of the fruit which the serpent had offered him (*ministro ... colubro*).

19,199. After *Ortui* in line 199 *Scri* originally wrote *vt*; the same hand thereupon crossed this word out and placed it instead after *respondeat*.

19,224. Correct the unmetrical form *Ori* (*LB*) to *Ore*, as in *Scri*. The mouth of God has breathed a rational soul into man: *Quid Dei mentem fuit indidisse / Ore capacem?* Compare lines 114-16: *Viua diuino bonus ille flatu / Indidit post haec opifex inertu / Semina massae*; *Carm.* 23,57-58: *Conditor, ignifluo cuius procedis ab ore, / ... statuam te vocat ipse suam*; Prudentius, *Cath.* 10,129-30: *Animae fuit haec domus olim / factoris ab ore creatae*.

19,231. *author* in *Scri* was altered by a subsequent hand to *auctor*, whence the spelling in *LB*.

19,268-69. Line 269 belongs with the following sentence. Put a full stop after *faeta* (268) and a comma after *pudica* (269); this is the punctuation of *LB*. *Scri* has a period after *faeta* and no punctuation after *pudica*.

19,285. *morae* reflects the spelling of *LB*; in *Scri* we read *more*. See below, on 21,312.

19,296. Correct Reedijk's unmetrical *Cadere* to *Sydere* (*Scri LB*). As Lebek explains (p. 313), *Sydere* (i.e., *sidere*) is the infinitive "to sink down".

19,299. A comma should be added after *terris* (Lebek).

19,302. The subject of *latitat* (301) is *Ipse ... rerum Dominus*: the Lord of Creation himself lies hidden within the shrine under the Virgin's breast. The comma after *Pectoris* in line 302, which has no basis in *Scri* or *LB*, should be removed.

19,303. For *circumdans* (*Scri LB*) Lebek prefers *circumdas*. He concedes that the "slight" change "is not absolutely necessary because one could connect *circumdans* with *mater* (301). But this", he adds, "would be a very harsh construction". From a purely grammatical point of view Lebek may well be right. The logic of poetry, however, is not always the logic of grammar. Erasmus wants the reader's undivided attention drawn to that miraculous paradox: the infinite Creator confined within a Virgin's womb. The emended form *circumdas* draws attention away

from this mystery and shifts it instead to the Virgin ("you enclose"). The emendation, moreover, would stop this long and impressive sentence two lines short of its natural conclusion — the end of the third strophe. The form *circundans* should stay.

19,307. *cathenas* is altered in *Scri* by a later hand to *catenas*, as in *LB*. Similarly in line 392 *cathenis* is changed to *catenis*, as in *LB*.

19,362. Remove Reedijk's comma after *Cuncta* and put it instead after *pascit*. This change, suggested by Lebek, in fact restores the punctuation of *Scri* and *LB*.

At the end of the poem *Scri* writes: *finis*. τέλος.

20. CARMEN DE MONSTROSIS SIGNIS CHRISTO MORIENTE FACTIS

Reedijk gives it as his opinion that "in classical Latin there is no example of a systema consisting of an Asclepiadeus minor followed by a iambic dimeter" and adds that "in the superscription the term Archiloicum is erroneously used" (p. 186). These statements need to be qualified. First: the verse form is patterned after Boethius, *Cons.* 3, M. 8, the first two lines of which run as follows: *Eheu, quae miseros tramite deuos / abducit ignorantia!* Second: the term "archilochian" was formerly used in a wider sense to designate various trochaic, dactylic, and iambic lines, including iambic dimeter as Erasmus uses it here. See for instance Diomedes, *Ars grammatica* (in *Grammatici Latini*, ed. Heinrich Keil, 8 vols. [1857-70; Hildesheim, 1961]) I, 509-11; Servius, *De centum metris* (Keil IV, 458-60 and 466-67); Marius Victorinus, *Ars grammatica* (Keil VI, 81); and Marius Plotius, *Ars grammatica* (Keil VI, 520).

20,12. *reclina* is a misreading for *recliua* (*Scri LB*). Reedijk has failed to observe the vocalic symbol above the *u* in *Scri*.

20,36. *Proposcit* is a misprint for *Poposcit* (*Scri LB*).

20,66. *Quis nam* (*Scri*) was altered by a later hand to *Quisnam*, as in *LB* and Reedijk.

20,75. The line as transmitted by *Scri* and *LB* presents a serious problem. The noun *vita* is modified by two adjectives *dura* and *mortua* which cannot very well both belong with it and which moreover are neither separated by a punctuation mark nor linked by a conjunction. As the line now stands we would have to translate as follows: "A hard life [when] dead [or: having died] has suffered a violent death". This, plainly, is meaningless. How can such a line possibly lead into the next one, *Sol ille verus occidit*? We are thus once again forced to suspect a

copyist's error. The mistake, fortunately, is not difficult to correct. The scribe who produced *Scri* either did not observe or did not copy the nasal bar over the final *a* of *Dura*. For *Duram* is surely what Erasmus had in mind, intending it as an adjective modifying *necem*. (That *mortua* originally had the nasal bar can be ruled out for metrical and semantic reasons). For *duram necem* compare the stock phrase *dura mors*: Vergil, *Geor.* 3,68; *Aen.* 10,791; Seneca, *Herc. furens* 56 (where other manuscripts read: *dirae mortis*) and 1069; Lucan 6,772; Iuvencus 4,368 and 475; Avitus, *Carm.* 3,61; as well as Erasmus, *Carm.* 19,141 (the fall of man brings *duram ... mortem* into the world — the hard death that Christ too, as Son of man and Second Adam, has now suffered); and *Carm.* 23,95. Compare also *Carm.* 21,64-65 (Christ bears Death's cruel yoke): *veteris durissima lethi / Imperia ipse ferens*; and *Carm.* 1,35: *dirae necis*.

The emendation of *Dura* to *Duram* demands more explanation. At first sight the change seems to offer improvement only in the distribution of adjectives, not in sense. Shall we now translate: "A dead life [or: A life that has died] has suffered a cruel death"? The very next verse (76) offers us the clue we need to escape from this quandary. There we read that "the true Sun has set [died]". Erasmus, in other words, is speaking in metaphorical terms. If we now apply this level of meaning to line 75 we recognize at once that *vita* must be read in the New Testament sense that Christ is the Life (Ioan. 14,6); compare Erasmus, *Carm.* 85,37 (Christ speaking): *Auctor ... vitae cum sim vnicus, ipsaque vita*. It follows that the adjective *mortua* refers to the paradox that Christ, the immortal Life, lived among us in a mortal body which has now died a cruel death. He is, in epigrammatic brevity, "the mortal Life", *mortua vita*¹⁸. For the phrasing of this paradox compare in particular Paulinus Aquileiensis, *Carm.* 6,14,2 ("De resurrectione Domini"): *mortua vita mortis regnum diripit*. The paradox recurs; see for example Vulg. Act. 3,15: *auctorem vero vitae interfecistis*; Ambrosius, *Hymnus ad Vesperas a pascha usque ad ascensionem* 7,3: *Iam mortua est vita omnium*; Venantius Fortunatus, *Carm.* 2,6,31 (from the famous hymn *Vexilla regis*): *vita mortem pertulit*; 9,2,44: *... pro me voluit hic mea vita mori*; and Erasmus, *Paraphr. in Rom.* 9,32 (*LB VII*, 810 A), heightening the paradox of Act. 3,15 through juxtaposition of the apparent opposites: *auctorem vitae morti tradentes*.

¹⁸ The phrase *mortua vita*, in a different sense (the life of sin, as in *Carm.* 29,5, *Mala vita mors est*), is found also in *Carm.* 23,84: *Quos pendant breuibz pro luxibus aspice luctus, / Quorum hic in vitiis mortua vita fuit*.

20,77. *Quid ni* in *Scri* was altered by a later hand to *Quidni*, the form which appears in *LB* and Reedijk.

20,79. *Authori que* in *Scri* was subsequently changed to *Auctorique*, as in *LB*.

21. CARMEN HEROICUM DE SOLEMNITATE PASCHALI

21,2. *choruscos* (*Scri*) was altered by a later hand to *coruscos*, the reading of *LB*.

21,5. Reedijk emends *vt quid* (*Scri LB*) to *et quid*. This is a mistake: *vt quid* is an idiomatic expression meaning *cur* in rhetorical questions. See, for example, Erasmus' translation of Euripides, *Hecuba* (ASD I-1, p. 226, 76): *Vt quid ita sub nocte silenti / Terriculis visisque exagitor?* Compare also *Ciris* 294: *vt quid ego amens / te erepta, o Britomarti, mei spes vna sepulchri, / te Britomarti, diem potui producere vitae?*; and especially Martial 3,77,10: ... *vt quid enim, Baetice*, σαπροφαγεῖς?

21,11. In lines 11-21 Erasmus describes the coming of Easter morning. Let the earth now pour forth its flowers, let the air resound with birds, let the sea smooth its stormy waves, let all nature rejoice and greet the Lord who is about to rise from the dead! All the verbs in this passage are in the subjunctive — except *plaudit* in line 11. Read *plaudat*.

21,18-19. Of the verb *cessent* Reedijk writes that it is "pluralis instead of singularis *per attractionem*", Here one must ask oneself: attraction to what? To the object of *attollere*? The reason why *cessent* is plural is that it has more than one subject: *Nimbosusque nothus ... et auster / Grandisonus*. Repunctuate lines 18-19 as follows: *Nimbosusque nothus, longe concedat et auster / Grandisonus, tumidos cessent attollere fluctus*. The meaning is: "and let the rainy southwind, let the howling southwester depart far hence, let them stop stirring up the swelling waves". (*Scri* and *LB* put a comma after *concedat*).

21,22. In the critical apparatus Reedijk notes: "superûm: *Scri parum legibil. quia man. post. tent. mut. LB superior haud feliciter*". But *Scri* originally wrote *superum*, not *superûm*. A later reader, presumably the copy editor for *LB*, misunderstood *superum* to be a (misspelled) adjective with *ordo* and emended it to *superus*. The new final *s*, however, only partially obscures the original *um*. As a result the first half of the *u* (with superscript vocalic mark still in place) looks somewhat like an *i*, the bottom half of the new *s* looks like an *o*, and the latter half of the *m* looks like an *n*. The compositor of *LB*, unable to make sense of this strange hybrid, *superion*, assumed that *superior* was meant — a semantically and metrically impossible form.

21,29. Supposing *modo* to be a noun in the ablative, Reedijk has emended *communia* (*Scri LB*) to *communi*. But *modo* here is the adverb. It does occur in Erasmus' poetry with a naturally long final syllable (see *Carm.* 19,134 and 139), but Erasmus may be simply lengthening it before the masculine caesura (compare *Carm.* 9,16 and 24,97; also see above, on *Carm.* 8,13; and below, line 273 *emensūs*, 295 *queāt*, 318 *abīt*). Be that as it may, it is plain that Reedijk's emendation is groundless — all the more so as it makes for little sense. Restore *communia*, and the sentence at once regains its intended meaning: "But the beneficent Father commands that mortals and immortals should now have all things in common". Man and God, heaven and earth, are henceforth reconciled. Compare the proverb *Amicorum communia omnia*, cited as early as *Epist.* 20, 82 and destined, in later editions, to open the *Adagia*. Compare also *Carm.* 94,24: [*gens Christigena*] *proprium nescit, sed habet communia cuncta*; and especially *Paraphr. in Coloss.* 2,10 (*LB VII*, 1010 B): *Illi* [i.e., *Christo*] *cum nihil desit, et sua velit vobis esse communia omnia, ...*

21,30. A comma is needed after *iubet* (*Scri* and *LB* have a colon there).

21,49 and 51. *Scri* originally wrote *tryumphos* here; this was altered by a later hand to *triumphos*, whence the spelling in *LB*. So too *tryumphali* in line 61 was altered to *triumphali*, as in *LB*.

21,85. Change *Necnon* to *Nec non*, as in *Scri LB*.

21,95. Correct *portendat* to *portendant* (*Scri LB Schmidt-Dengler*).

21,104. *Scri* writes *expirante*; this was altered by a later hand to *exspirante*, the form in *LB*.

21,107. Reedijk's emendation *captis* for *ceptis* (*Scri LB*) should be rejected. At Christ's coming into Hell a great fury wells up in Satan's heart. For *furiis ... ceptis* [i.e., *coeptis*] compare Boccaccio, *Ecl.* 8,38: ... *cepto fauit fortuna furori*. The phrase *furiis inter praecordia*, I should add, is borrowed from Prudentius, *Psychom.* 10: *quaeue acies furiis inter praecordia mixtis / obsistat meliore manu*.

21,118. Satan, addressing his cohorts in hell, laments that he, the great Deceiver, has been deceived by Christ¹⁹. He had noticed Jesus' miracles and had tested him three times in the desert to see if he were truly the Son of God, but Christ had artfully concealed his divinity from him. As

¹⁹ On the "deception of Satan" see J. A. MacCulloch, *The Harrowing of Hell. A Comparative Study of an Early Christian Doctrine* (Edinburgh, 1930), pp. 199-216. See also Erasmus, *Carm.* 19,197-200, and 35,31-32.

far as Satan (or, for that matter, anyone else on earth) could tell, Jesus was human, not divine. For did not everything about the man argue for his humanity? He suffered cold and hunger²⁰; as a squalling infant he drank from his mother's breast; he grew up into manhood; finally he died on the cross. Such too were the thoughts that had occupied Satan's mind earlier, as he contemplated testing Jesus in the desert. Here is how Erasmus, in his *Paraphr. in Euang. Lucae* 4,2 (LB VII, 318 EF), reconstructs Satan's frame of mind before the Temptations:

Audierat venturum illum, qui fracturus esset ipsius vires, et an iam venisset, dubitabat; quis autem is esset, ignorabat. Hic enim fallendus erat arte diuina, qui prius suis dolis fefellerat genus humanum. Audierat Ioannem palam profitentem: non sum ego Christus. Proinde quum multa conspexisset in Christo, quae virtutis humanae modum excederent: rursus quum videret esurientem et affligi corporis inedia, quum Moses et Elias post totidem dierum ieiunium non legantur esurisse, suspicatus est nihil aliud esse Iesum quam hominem ...

Satan's arguments for Christ's humanity are traditional ones: Jesus ate, drank, slept, suffered pain and fatigue, experienced such human emotions as grief and anger, grew up into adulthood and died, just like other men. Erasmus himself frequently employs them to prove that Christ was not a spectre but the Son of man, one of us. In his *Ratio verae theologiae* (LB V, 94 F), for example, he writes: *Hominem verum arguunt, quod sese subinde vocat filium Adae, quod adolescit solitis aetatibus, quod dormit, quod vescitur, quod esurit, quod sitit, quod ex itinere lassescit, quod humanis affectibus tangitur*²¹.

In view of this context we cannot let the phrase *morte parentum* (118) stand. It has to be a copyist's error. Reedijk, to be sure, attempts an explanation, glossing *morte* with *mortalitate*, but that will not do. Christ did not hunger and thirst, grow up, experience the whole gamut of human emotions because of his parents' or forefathers' *mortality*, but because he, like them, was *human*. As Erasmus argues in his *Disputatio de taedio et pauore Christi* (LB V, 1269 F), Jesus was a perfect and true

²⁰ See for example Matth. 25,35, where Christ at the Last Judgment says: *esuriui sitiui ...*

²¹ See further: *In Ps. IV concio*, ASD V-2, p. 243, 615-16; *Enarratio in Ps. XXXIII*, ASD V-3, p. 111, 614-18; p. 154, 292-93; *Concio de puero Iesu*, LB V, 602 D; *Disputatio de taedio et pauore Christi*, LB V, 1270 D and 1277 D; *Paraphr. in Euang. Ioann.* 1,1 (LB VII, 498 BC); 1,14 (LB VII, 504 B); 4,6 (LB VII, 526 C); 16,8 (LB VII, 620 D); *Paraphr. in Philipp.* 2,7 (LB VII, 996 C).

man *ex natura quam assumpsit de matre Virgine*. Mortality is only one part of the human condition; it can account for Christ's dying but not for the other aspects of his humanity. And was not Adam by nature already mortal before the Fall? That at least is Erasmus' opinion in the *Disputatio*: [*Christus*] *mortalitatem assumpsit, quae et ante peccatum erat in Adam* (LB V, 1270 E). Nor will it do to explain *morte* by referring to our first parents' sin which brought death into the world. Death, to be sure, is one of the many consequences of sin; but you cannot very well adduce that one particular effect of sin — death — to explain such other effects of original sin as *infantia, imbecillitas aetatis, sitis, fames, lassitudo, tristitia, dolor, dormituriatio, et mille nostrae vitae huius labores* (LB V, 1270 D). Furthermore, let us suppose that Adam had not sinned. Would he then not have felt the same quintessentially human emotions and passions that Christ too, in his humanity, experienced? Erasmus for one was at no loss to answer this question. In the *Disputatio* (LB V, 1270 B) he asserts that Jesus took upon himself *perfectam hominis naturam ... cum omnibus affectibus, qui futuri fuerant in Adam, si in nativa conditione perseuerasset, Corpus sensibile, Animam sensibilem, et naturalibus passionibus obnoxiam*.

Now in order to express this in the present passage Erasmus can hardly have written *morte parentum*, which makes no sense whatsoever, theological or otherwise. We should therefore emend the phrase to *more parentum*, a stock phrase especially at the end of the hexameter²². Christ suffered cold, hunger, and thirst, was a crying infant at the breast, grew up through the natural stages of life, and finally died — just as his forefathers had done, *more parentum*. Welcome support for this emendation is further offered by the *Paraphr. in Hebr.* 2,16 (LB VII, 1169 C) where Erasmus lays particular stress on Christ's similarity to his forefathers in all the respects we have been discussing: *Iudaeus natus est ex Iudaeis, homo natus est ex homine, obnoxius omnibus nostrae naturae incommodis, siti, fami, aestui, frigori, lassitudini, dolori, morti, quo similitudo testaretur veram naturae cognationem*. For the use of *parentum* in this context compare Prudentius, *Apoth.* 998-99: *Christum inuenies de carne parentum / effluxisse hominum*.

21,127. *perniciem* is Reedijk's spelling; *Scri* and *LB* read *pernitium*.

21,138. *Deductum* (*Scri LB*) must be a copyist's error for *Deductam*

²² For the tag *more parentum* see Catullus 101,7; Vergil, *Aen.* 6,223; Statius, *Theb.* 2,253; Silius, *Pun.* 6,484 and 660; 7,177; 8,548 and 585.

since the past participle modifies the feminine accusative singular noun *lampada* (line 137), just as *immissum* (136) modifies *diem* (137). Also add a comma after *Deductam* to separate it from the following past participle *ingressa*. This participle is neuter accusative plural to sum up *diem* and *lampada*, both of which penetrate the depths of the underworld on Phoebus' rose-streaked chariot.

21,190. Reedijk treats lines 188-95 as one continuous sentence which they clearly are not. Lines 188-190 tell us who are in limbo, the reader having to supply verb and subject (*Hic sunt illi ...*). Lines 191-95 represent a second sentence telling us what these souls are doing as they await the Redeemer. A full stop after *profundam* (190), as in *Scri* and *LB*, is a must²³.

21,211. The grammatical structure of lines 211-12 will become clearer if we set off *nascens vbi caeperat orbis* with commas; *Scri* and *LB* use parentheses here.

21,212. In the critical apparatus Reedijk notes: "pectore scripsi, *Scri LB* pectora". In fact only *Scri* reads *pectora*; *LB* has emended this to *pectore*.

21,233. Change *necnon* to *nec non*, as in *Scri LB*.

The adjective *laetissima* in line 233 belongs with *pubes* in line 234; the clause after all is introduced by *nec non*, "and also". *Turba* (233) is already modified by *adulta* (232). The grownups are followed by the merry and lightfooted group of young people (*pubes*), both boys and girls. We should accordingly eliminate the full stop after *gressu* in line 233 (there is none there in *Scri* and *LB*) and put a comma after *pubes* (as in *LB*; *Scri* has a colon there).

21,250. *Scri* originally wrote *choruscans*; this was subsequently altered to *coruscans*, as in *LB*.

21,257-58. In lines 257-60 Reedijk follows the punctuation of *Scri* and *LB*. This has led Schmidt-Dengler (p. 275) to mistranslate these lines as follows: "So war der Schmuck der Gesteine, so war der Schein des gelben und rötlichen Goldes, da sie mit wunderbarem Blitzen die von oben empfangenen Flammen widerspiegeln und im roten feinen Linnen wie die Sterne am Himmel funkelten". This translation overlooks the correlative *que — et* construction in line 257 indicating that both *lapidum* and *auri* are genitive objects with *decor*. Or, to put it

²³ Pierre Laurens, *Musae reduces. Anthologie de la poésie latine dans l'Europe de la Renaissance*, II (Leiden, 1975), 112-13, has no punctuation after *profundam* in his text, but translates as if there were.

differently, *auri* belongs with *decor*, not with *species* in the next line. Line 257 accordingly should end with a comma, to separate it from the next verse.

Schmidt-Dengler too, believing that *et* in line 257 links the adjectives *flauentis* and *rutuli*, takes *rutuli* to belong with *auri*. But *et*, as we have seen, is correlative with *que*; and *auri* does not need another adjective — certainly not one so closely related in meaning. If *rutuli* does not belong with *auri*, how does it fit into the sentence? It is not a genitive neuter or masculine singular, but a nominative masculine plural recalling in particular the precious stones mentioned in line 257 and thus acting as the subject of *reuomunt* in line 259 and *Scintillant* in line 260. The “*rutuli lapides*” on Christ’s robe reflect the dazzling light of Christ’s sun-like diadem and shine like so many stars in the sky. Line 258, therefore, needs to be repunctuated too: the comma now following *rutuli* should be removed and placed instead at the caesura, after *species*. For *Talis erat species* compare Vergil, *Aen.* 6,208: *talis erat species auri frondentis opaca / ilice*; and especially (since used, as here, without a genitive object) Ausonius, *Cento nupt.* 44: *talis erat species, ...*

21,258. *Scri* uses the medieval spelling *rutuli* for *rutili* (*LB*). We find the form for instance in Erasmus’ edition of Willem Hermans’ *Sylua odorum* (Paris: Marchand, 1497), fol. a7^r: *Dona depromunt virides smaragdos: / Aemulumque ignis rutuli Pyropum.*

21,273. *Scri* writes *astat*; a later hand changed this to *adstat*, the reading of *LB*.

21,287. Christ’s followers are tormented by the absence of the Lord. For three days now they have been anxiously waiting. All their tears seem to have flowed in vain. To get this meaning across we shall need a punctuation change. Since the enclitic *-que* in line 286 signals the beginning of a new main clause, the verb of which is *Plangitur* in line 288, we should get rid of the full stop at the end of line 287; neither *Scri* nor *LB* have a punctuation mark there.

21,291. *Scri* originally wrote *exanguia*. This was changed by a later hand to *exsanguia*, whence the reading in *LB* and Reedijk.

21,310. The form *exsangui* comes from *LB*; *Scri* reads *exangui*.

21,312. *morae*, which Reedijk believed to be an emendation introduced by J. Jortin, is in fact a classicized spelling of *more*, the reading of *Scri*. In *Scri* the letter *m* is slightly separated from the rest of the word; a scribal mark above and slightly to the left of this *m* looks somewhat like the dot of an *i*. This has led the compositor of *LB* (and Reedijk as well)

to misread the word as *in ore*. See also above, on *Carm.* 19,285. For the scribal mark used here to indicate an *m* see also below, on *Carm.* 46,23.

21,315 and 316. *Scri* writes *Aspice*; this was changed by a later hand to *Adspice*, as in *LB*.

21,328-29. What is keeping Christ so long? Even the disciples are beginning to lose hope and faith. Return, o Christ, and dispel the gloom in their hearts! *Discipulis* in line 329 belongs with *Ipsis* in line 328. Drop the semicolon after *fidesque* (328) and put it after *Discipulis* instead (*Scri* and *LB* have no punctuation at the end of line 328, but have a comma after *Discipulis*). For lines 228-29 *Ipsis* — *Discipulis* compare *Paraphr. in Euang. Lucae* 24,9 (*LB* VII, 466 D); the women return from the sepulchre to tell the disciples: *properant ad vndecim Apostolos, caeterosque discipulos, qui ob metum Iudaeorum sparsim collecti latitabant, obliti et ipsi fere omnium quae dixerat Iesus, ac propemodum desperantes*.

21,333. *Scri* originally read *Otyus*; this was altered by a later hand to *Ocyus*, whence this reading in *LB* and Reedijk.

21,334. *Scri* writes *aspiciens*; a later hand changed this to *adspiciens*, as in *LB*.

21,337. *tellus* should be followed by a comma as in *LB*. *Scri* originally had a period there, but this was changed by a later hand to a comma.

21,342. Reedijk's faulty punctuation follows *Scri* and *LB*. But *Titana* is the accusative object of *latuit*: "it did not remain hidden from the sun that it was being outshone by a new Sun". The comma after *Titana* should be dropped since the accusative-infinitive construction *nouo* — *vinci* is dependent on *latuit*, not on *Sensit*; see also above, on lines 336-38. A semicolon at the end of line 342 would be helpful.

21,344. *Scri* originally had *Authorique*; a later hand changed this to *Auctorique*, whence the reading in *LB*.

21,347. *festiuus* is a misreading for *festinus* (*Scri LB*).

At the end *Scri* writes *finis*. This is crossed out; immediately following it, apparently in the same hand, is *τελος*.

22. RHYTHMUS IAMBICUS IN LAudem ANNAE, AUIAE IESU CHRISTI

The poem is reprinted in Vol. V of *BAS*, not in III as Reedijk indicates.

22,52. Joachim and Anna never cease praying to God to give them a child and take the stigma of childlessness from them. The reading *pröbe*

in line 52 violates both meter and sense and should therefore be changed to *prôle*, as in the Egerton manuscript; cf. line 55 *prole*. For *probrum* in the same line *Eg* erroneously reads *proborum*.

22,74-75. For *gigneret* in line 74 (not 75, as Reedijk reports) *Eg* reads *gignere*. Line 75 is lacking in *Eg*.

22,81. *reducit* is a misprint for *reduxit* (*Epigramm.* of 1518; *BAS LB*).

22,94. *flum* is a misprint for *filium* (*Epigramm.* of 1518; *BAS LB*).

23-25.

Reedijk does not record that in β (his copy text) the general title of *Carmm.* 23-25 is given on the verso of the title page as: *Elegiae protrepticae, ad capessendam virtutem, relictis viciorum alimentis. Opus ceptum tantum*; and at the head of the poems themselves as: *Elegiae protrepticae, detestantes errores mortalium, et adhortantes ad veram pietatem, Erasmi Roterodami*.

23. ELEGIA PRIMA IN ERRORES HOMINUM DEGENERANTIUM

23,2. The line should end with an exclamation mark, not a comma.

23,7-14. These lines have marginal glosses in β which Reedijk has neglected to note. They are as follows: lines 7-8: *Auaricia*; 9-10: *Voluptas*; 11-12: *Ambitio*; 13-14: *Curiositas*.

23,10. *mortifera* is a misprint for *mortiferae* (β); *Sil Ferguson* have *mortifere*. Compare *Carm.* 24,6: *Gaudia lasciuiae carnis amica sequi*. The phrase *mortiferae ... carnis* is found in Sedulius Scottus, *Carminum Appendix* 2,33.

23,24-26. In β lines 25 and 26 both end with a comma (*Sil* has no punctuation mark there). These commas may be taken as a signal that the lines are part of the series of questions which begins with line 23 and ends with line 29. If we see 25-26 as a question introduced by *Quid* in line 23 we can better account for the *et* in line 25: it does not link the *Quaeris* of line 25 back to the *Quaeris* of line 21. Why should Erasmus now want to interrupt the rhetorical questions with a statement of fact? We will therefore understand lines 23-29 as a continuous series of questions, each introduced by *quid* (23. 27. 29): "Why try to catch fish in the mountains and hares in the sea and look for fruit in a thicket of willows and for grapes in a bramblebush? Why do you hunt after pleasures in a world of woe? And why are you taking delight in luxury when you are in fact in prison?" We should accordingly repunctuate

lines 24, 25, and 26. Put a comma at the end of line 24, a comma at the end of line 25, and a question mark at the end of line 26. It should be noted that in lines 23-26, which we now recognize more clearly as a unit, Erasmus is imitating Boethius, *Cons.* 3, M. 8,1-8:

Eheu, quae miseros tramite deuos
 abducit ignorantia!
 Non aurum in viridi quaeritis arbore
 nec vite gemmas carpitis,
 non altis laqueos montibus abditis
 vt pisce ditetis dapes
 nec vobis capreas si libeat sequi
 Tyrrhena captatis vada.

(Boethius' conclusion in lines 20-22 is echoed in Erasmus' lines 31-42, especially 41-42). Erasmus himself, in the first edition of his *Adagia* of 1500, fol. a8^r, points to Boethius' series of impossibilia as a model for those who wish to use the adage *In aere piscari Venari in mari*. He explains: *Quo verbo recte vtemur: qum negabimus ibi querendum esse quippiam: vbi inveniri minime possit Vt si quis in opibus aut voluptatibus beatam vitam querat Quibus quidem metaphoris Boetius eciam in carmine vtitur.*

23,32. Reedijk writes *si credis*, following *Sil*. In accordance with his stated principle of preferring the text of β he ought to have written: *si credes*. This is a perfectly acceptable form. See Ovid, *Her.* 17(18),121 (in the same metrical position): *si credes*, which is Palmer's emendation for the manuscript reading *si credis* (al.: *si credas*).

23,38. The comma after *risus* should be removed (there is no punctuation there in *Sil* or β): *et* links line 38 back to line 37, *iste* belongs with *risus*, and *graues* with *lachrymas*. Construe: *et vertitur risus iste in lachrymas graues*.

23,44. For *malefida* both *Sil* and β read *male fida*. Cf. *Carm.* 25,27: *malefidus* (*Sil* β).

23,58. A sidenote in β cites Vulg. Gen. 1,26: *Ad imaginem nostram*.

24. ELEGIA SECUNDA, IN IUENEM LUXURIA DEFLUENTEM

24,1. *imberbi* (β) is spelled *imbarbi* in *Sil*; Reedijk notes the different spelling of the word in line 84 but neglects to do so here.

24,23. *ne* is the enclitic particle. It should for consistency's sake be written together with the preceding *Tu* (so also: Schmidt-Dengler;

Ferguson writes *Tu ne*). Compare for example *Carm.* 25,112 where Ferguson (following *Sil* β) prints *iam ne*, Reedijk *iamne*.

24,46. The spelling *nimbis* comes from *Sil*; β reads *nymbis*.

24,67. Correct *lene caput* (*Sil* and β) to *leue caput*: a shiny pate is one of the *incommoda* of old age. Here (as indeed throughout his description of the horrors of old age) Erasmus has Juvenal's famous vituperation in mind. Compare in particular *Sat.* 10,198-99: *vna senum facies, cum voce trementia membra / et iam leue caput madidique infantia nasi*. Erasmus also drew on these Juvenalian lines in his *De contemptu mundi* (*ASD* V-1, p. 54, 378-80): *quibus iam leue caput, malae pendulae, ... nasus perpetuo madens*.

24,80. In writing *exsaturare* Reedijk has preferred the spelling of *Sil*; the authorized edition β has *exaturare*.

25. ELEGIA TERCIA, IN DIUITEM AUARUM

25,16. *nocitura* is quoted from line 13; put it within quotation marks.

25,49. The spelling of *prescia* comes from *Sil*; one might have expected that Reedijk, with his bias towards the more classical spelling and stated preference for the later authorized version, would have followed β in writing *praescia*.

25,65. *Arca beata* parallels *copia rerum*. A comma is needed after *quidam* to separate the two nouns; *Sil* has a virgule there, β a comma. (Ferguson puts an exclamation mark after *quidem*, but that is based on a false reading of the text).

25,71. *Tityi* is Reedijk's spelling; *Sil* reads *Ticii* while β writes *Titii*.

25,72. For *Vultura* (β) *Sil* reads *Vltura*.

25,84. *non* derives from *Sil*. Reedijk fails to note that β reads *nec* and does not explain why he prefers the reading of *Sil* here to that of the authorized version.

25,100. The line should end with a question mark (*Sil* β put one at the end of line 98).

25,105. *Mox ... vt* belong together: "for as soon as Fortuna has turned her swift wheel, what is yours today will suddenly be another's tomorrow, and though you be Croesus himself, one single day will make you an *Irus*". Compare *De contemptu mundi* (*ASD* V-1, p. 47, 209-11): *Quae tu tanto temporum spacio, tanta molestia, per fas nefasque vnde-cumque congeessisti, si fortuna (vt aiunt) rotam verterit, continuo te deserto alio commigrabunt, tuque modo Creso beator subito Irus eris*. The

comma after *etenim* (β) should be removed (*Sil* has no punctuation there). The colon at the end of line 105 should be changed to a comma, as in β; *Sil* has no punctuation there.

26. AD LESBIUM, DE NUMMO THEMATION

The heading of *Carm.* 26 in *Sil* is not what Reedijk reports it to be. *Sil* writes *phalenticum* (i.e., *phaleuticum*) for *phaloecium* (β). Nor does the title in *Sil* stop after *hendecasyllabum* as Reedijk states. In fact *Sil* also, though on a separate line, has the title *De Nummo*. *Sil* does, however, lack the final word of the title in β: *Themation*.

At the end of the poem β adds: *Finis*.

29. EPITAPHIUM ODILIAE

For *cimeterio* in the heading read *cimiterio* (α; *Epigramm.* of 1518; *BAS*); *cimiterium* is a late classical and medieval variant of *coemeterio* (*LB*). Cf. *Epist.* 1211,341: *coemiterio*.

29,10. *benigo* is a misprint for *benigno* (α; *Epigramm.* of 1518; *BAS LB*).

29,11-12. Change the colons in both lines to commas (so too: *Epigramm.* of 1518; *BAS LB*) or, in line 12, drop the colon altogether. The colon produces too long a pause at the wrong place in line 12; note that the caesura comes after the penthemimer, after *quid*. In α the line is punctuated as follows: *Condi sepulchro: quid? nisi occari sata?* The *Epigramm.* of 1518 and *BAS LB* put a comma after *sepulchro* and a question mark after *quid* and *sata*.

29,11. After *mori* Reedijk has forgotten the verb *est* (α; *Epigramm.* of 1518; *BAS LB*).

29,18. *Quarum* in line 18 is a misprint for *Quorum* (α; *Epigramm.* of 1518; *BAS LB*).

29,26-27. Line 26 is a complete sentence with no grammatical connection to the following verse. End it with a full stop. Line 27, by contrast, begins the sentence that ends in line 31; *Bona pars* is the subject of *Captat* (28). Drop the semicolon at the end of line 27; α, *Epigramm.* of 1518, and *BAS LB* have no punctuation there either.

At the end of the poem in α we find: *τελος*.

30. EIUSDEM QUERELA DE FILIO SUPERSTITE

30,18. For *ista* (*Epigramm.* of 1518; *BAS LB*) we find *illa* in α.

31. RESPONDET FILIUS

31.8. The verse, which introduces a lengthy prayer, should end with a colon. Lines 9-20 might be set off with quotation marks.

31.9. *autor* is the spelling of the 1518 *Epigrammata* and *BAS*. In *a* we find *author*; *LB* writes *auctor*. As so often, Reedijk follows the spelling of the 1518 *Epigrammata* but without any great consistency. Thus he writes *vitaleis* in line 12, following the 1518 edition; the 1506/7 *Epigrammata* reads *vitalis*. In *Carm.* 33,24 (misnumbered as 33,23), however, he reverses course and writes *rubentes* as in the editio princeps and rejects the reading *rubenteis* of the 1518 edition).

32. IOANNI OKEGO MUSICO SUMMO EPITAPHIUM

Reedijk's spelling follows that of the 1518 *Epigrammata*.

32,24 and 29. In the opening lines of the poem (1-4) Erasmus asks rhetorically: *Ergone conticuit / Vox illa quondam nobilis, / Aurea vox Okegi? / Sic musicae extinctum decus?* His question is answered, first implicitly by an exhortation to Apollo, the Muses, and all musicians to lament and shed tears, and then explicitly by the statement that Ockegem, that sacred Phoenix of music, is dead. This question-statement pattern is twice repeated (lines 15-24 and 25-29) and is inverted, in the concluding lines 30-31, for reasons of variation and symmetry. "Has that golden voice of Ockegem's fallen silent? Lament! He has died" (1-14). "What have you done, envious Death? Ockegem's golden voice, once the equal of Orpheus', has fallen silent" (15-24). "What have you done, envious — or rather, most unjust — Death? You should have contented yourself with taking all things human" (25-29). "Music is divine. Why have you profaned it?" (30-31) That this structural pattern is not apparent in Reedijk's edition is due to his retaining the Renaissance punctuation of line 24 with its concluding question mark. This question mark, however, is most likely an error owing to the close parallel in wording to lines 1-4. By lines 13-14, as we have seen, that question has been unequivocally answered: Ockegem, the paragon of musicians, is dead. Thus, when Erasmus again asks a rhetorical question, he cannot very well want to repeat the obvious, but to shift instead from lament to reproach: *Quid facis inuida mors?* (15). Lines 16-24 (which, it should be observed, are not introduced by an enclitic *-ne* as are lines 1-4) have the function of reiterating and elaborating on the answer of lines 13-14, and they do this by plaintively echoing the words of lines 1-4. The question

mark at the end of line 24 should, therefore, be changed to a full stop. (Jean-Claude Margolin, though reprinting Reedijk's text, cannot quite make up his mind whether our passage is a statement or a question and compromises by translating lines 16-18 as a statement and 19-24 as a question²⁴). The comma at the end of line 29 (derived from the 1518 *Epigrammata*) should be turned into a full pause, as in *BAS LB* and Margolin's translation, p. 88, though not his Latin text, p. 87; α has no punctuation at the end of line 29.

At the end of the poem α writes $\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$.

33. CARMEN DE CASA NATALICIA IESU

In the critical apparatus to the heading of this ode Reedijk misprints *Rotterdammensis* (α α_1) as *Rotterdamensis*. The heading in β and *F* is different from that of α α_1 , but this is not recorded by Reedijk. In β we find: *Ode dicolos distrophos altero versu heroico hexametro / altero Iambico dimetro. De Casa natalicia pueri Iesu deque paupere puerperio virginis deiparae Mariae*. The heading in the 1518 *Epigrammata* is essentially the same as that of β , with only minor differences in punctuation and capitalization and one spelling variant: *natalitia*.

Although he takes the heading of the poem from α α_1 , Reedijk does not adopt their readings or spelling. Instead he prefers to follow now β , now *F*.

Every verse of this poem is misnumbered.

33,52 (51). The critical apparatus should record that *BAS LB* make *nobilis* an adjective with *puella*, not with *spectaculi*, by putting a comma after *nobilis* rather than after *puella*. This is a change worth noting, as *nobilis* was a traditional adjective for the Virgin: see for instance Prudentius, *Cath.* 11,53; Petrus Damiani, *Carm.* B,30,1 (ed. M. Lokrantz); Mone, *Hymn.* II, 277, no. 508,126; 339,2; 341,5; 489,1; 515,2; 522,48; 598,14; Erasmus, *Paeon Virg. Matri*, *LB V*, 1229 E; *Liturgia Virg. Lauretanae*, *ASD V-1*, p. 98, 44.

33,53 (52). For *defixis* we find *deficis* in α .

33,65 (64). After *parentem* put a comma, as in *F BAS LB*; β prints a colon here.

²⁴ Jean-Claude Margolin, *Erasme et la musique*, De Pétrarque à Descartes, 9 (Paris, 1965), p. 88. The same correction is made in *Erasmus plechtig herdacht op 30 april 1969 in het Stadhuis van Brussel naar aanleiding van zijn geboorte vijf eeuwen geleden*. Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren, en Schone Kunsten van België (Brussels, 1969), p. 95.

34-37. IN LAUDEM BEATISSIMORUM ANGELORUM

Reedijk does not record the general heading for *Carmm.* 34-37 in *Eg* (in the margin). It reads: *In laudem Angelorum*.

The title printed by Reedijk for *Carm.* 34 is the general heading for *Carmm.* 34-37 in the two early Paris editions (see the headnote, p. 227). This general title ends with *feliciter incipit*. The next words, *Inuocatio propositionem complectens*, which Reedijk prints as part of the title, should be printed on a separate line, as in α_1 where this subtitle is preceded by the symbol ¶. It is in fact the heading to lines 1-16 which serve as introduction to the poems on the archangels and all the angels. Beginning with line 17 the ode to St. Michael begins; hence the new title in *Eg*: *De Michaele* (not *Michaele*, as Reedijk writes). This heading, though not used in the printed editions, might well be inserted into the text of a new edition since otherwise the Michael-ode will be the only one of the cycle without a title of its own.

The general title as it appears in *L F* is also found in *BAS LB*.

34,1. The reading *Michaele* (α_1 and the 1518 *Epigrammata*) is an ablative where a vocative is required. Read *Michael* with α *Eg BAS LB*, of which Reedijk mentions only the first; compare lines 18 and 73.

34,5. *Sordide* ($\alpha\alpha_1$ *Eg*) is spelled *Sordidae* in at least some of the later editions: *F BAS LB*. It is clearly an adjective with *odae* in line 6, not an adverb. The sense of lines 5-6 therefore is: "But lest the unclean odes of the singer be deservedly held of no account ...". Either Reedijk thought of *Sordide* as an adverb, in which case he ought to have noted the variant form; or he saw it as an adjective with *odae*, in which case he ought to have changed it to *Sordidae* in the same way he writes *odae* for *ode* in line 6; *arae* for *are* in 9; *Luridae* ... *maculae* for *Luride* ... *macule* in 13; *aequum* for *equum* in 15; and so forth. (See also below, on 35,13. In the critical apparatus to *Carm.* 34,54 and 38,3 Reedijk meticulously notes the change from *-e* to *-ae*; on many other occasions the change goes unheralded).

34,11. For *Applicet* we find *Applice* in *Eg*.

34,17. *vindicato* (*LB*) is written as *vendicato* in α α_1 *Eg F BAS*.

34,39. For *olim* we find *idem* in *Eg*.

34,51. For *Fulminisque* we find *Fulminis* in *Eg*. For *vomebat* in the same line *Eg* originally wrote *mouebat*; this is crossed out and replaced, by the same hand, with *vomebat*.

34,53. For *terret* we find *terre* in *Eg*.

34,54. *Eg* (like $\alpha\alpha_1$) writes *Bellue*.

34,55. *Eg* (like $\alpha\alpha_1$ L) writes *absortam*.

34,56. In the margin *Eg* repeats: *Reddere*.

34,62. For *ac labantis* α reads *at labantis*, while α_1 has *at labentis*. For *ac* in this line *Eg* writes &.

34,71. The line is omitted in α_1 .

34,73. For *manet* we find *mane* in $\alpha\alpha_1$.

34,77. In the margin of *Eg* beside *Ergo* we find the gloss *proinde* (the letter *i* is not clearly discernible in the photocopy and looks more like an *o*).

34,82. For *res* we find *des* in *Eg*.

34,90. The variant form *vocabulum* also occurs in *Eg*.

35. DE SINGULARI LAUDE GABRIELIS ARCHANGELI

Eg gives the following heading: *Gabrielis laus*.

$\alpha\alpha_1$ have several marginal notes which Reedijk does not record in the critical apparatus: 11 *Circuitio*; 20 *Narratio* (*Narracio* in α_1); and 49 *Dubitatio*.

35,3-4. The vocative *o tonantis* / *Armiger alti* clearly belongs with the next sentence. Put the question mark after *colit* (3), as in *F* and *LB*; $\alpha\alpha_1$ and *Eg* have a colon here. After *alti* (4) $\alpha\alpha_1$ *F LB* print a period; *Eg* has no punctuation here.

35,13. *Zacharie* is a dative; elsewhere Reedijk commonly follows the later editions which, however, here print the ending as *-ae*. See above, on 34,5.

35,14. A comma is needed after *sacellis* (so too: *F BAS LB*); $\alpha\alpha_1$ enclose line 14 in parentheses.

35,18. *F* prints *nunci* for *nuncii*.

35,31. The reading *ne resciscat* occurs not just in α_1 (as Reedijk implies), but also in α .

35,34. For *placido* we find *placito* in *Eg*.

After 35,36 α (but not α_1) inserts: ¶ *Commiscet physicam rationem cum byblie hystoria*.

35,50. The scribe of *Eg* first wrote *Hesitas* and then, crossing this out, wrote *Hesitat*.

35,59. *primum* is a misprint for *primus* (so: $\alpha\alpha_1$ *Eg F BAS LB*).

36. DE SINGULARI LAUDE RAPHAELIS

The heading in *F BAS* omits *singulari*. In *Eg* the heading is *Raphahelis laus* (not *Raphaelis laus*, as Reedijk indicates).

36,3. *Tu te* (*LB*) should be printed as one word, as in $\alpha\alpha_1$ *Eg F*, since *te* is the emphatic particle, not the accusative of *tu*. Compare *Carm.* 8,60: *Ne dubita, in manibus pendet victoria nostris, / Tute modo aduertas aurem animumque mihi.*

36,5-6. The phrase *Rebus afflictis* in line 6 belongs with line 5: Raphael is a healer of men in times of trouble. Delete the comma after *medela* (5) and insert it instead after *afflictis* (6). This is also the punctuation of *F BAS LB*. *Eg* has a period after *afflictis*; $\alpha\alpha_1$ have no punctuation after *medela* or *afflictis*.

36,8. Through Raphael's help Tobias regained his sight. Now he could see his son returning not only in good health but also with great riches, a large household, and much cattle and camels (Tob. 11,13-18). The adjectives *saluum* (9), *Diuitem* (10 and 11) and *laetum* (12) belong with *gnatum* (8). For this reason the full stop after *gnatum* (so in $\alpha\alpha_1$ *F BAS LB*) should be changed to a comma.

36,10. For *multa* we find *longa* in *Eg*.

36,11. *Eg* (like $\alpha\alpha_1$ and *L*) omits *ac*.

36,13. $\alpha\alpha_1$ add a marginal note: *Circuitio*; and beneath this, beside line 14: *Aesculapium*.

37. DE VNIUERSIS ANGELIS

37,5. *BAS* and *LB* omit *ter*.

37,11. *quod* is a misprint for *quos* ($\alpha\alpha_1$ *Eg F BAS LB*).

37,35. *Eg* (like $\alpha\alpha_1$) writes *tondat*.

37,50. For *nostis* we find the erroneous form *nostris* in *LB*.

37,51. For *ac* we find *et* in *Eg*.

37,70. For *vos rata* we find *vox rara* in α_1 .

38. AD GAGUINUM NONDUM VISUM CARMEN HENDECASYLLABUM

The poem's heading in *Eg* is: *hendecasillabum carmen*.

The poem's orthography in Reedijk's edition follows *F*.

38,4. Correct *Necnon* (*BAS*) to *Nec non*, as in β *F LB*. For *Nec non Parmeno vti* in the same line *Eg* reads *Ac parmeno velut* (like $\alpha\alpha_1$).

38,9-11. The lines should be put within quotation marks, since they are the Muses' response.

38,11. For *ac* we find *et* in *Eg* (as in $\alpha\alpha_1$).

In all the early editions line 11 ends with a question mark. This should be restored to the text.

38,16. For *Tam* we find *Tum* in *Eg*.

38,24. For *ille* we find *ore* in *Eg* (as in $\alpha\alpha_1$).

38,25. The line is lacking in *Eg*.

38,30-31. The variant reading *ora-* / *tum*, which is earlier found in β and *F*, also occurs in *BAS LB*.

At the end of the poem $\alpha\alpha_1$ write: *Finis*; β prints: $\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$.

39. IN ANNALES GAGUINI ET EGLOGAS FAUSTINAS CARMEN

Reedijk neglects to record the title of the poem as it appears in *Eg*: *In ga et fa. HE*, i.e., *In Gaguinum et Faustum Herasmus*. In $\alpha\alpha_1$ we find the following heading: *Carmen lyricum de hystoriis Roberti Gaguini atque eglogis Fausti. Inducit secum loquentem faustinam musam*.

Several sidenotes in $\alpha\alpha_1$ should have been noted in the apparatus criticus; following 14 and 21: *Thalia*; following 17 and 26: *Heras.*; following 29: *Translatio*.

In orthography Reedijk follows *F*. While he records some spelling variants for $\alpha\alpha_1$ the list is quite incomplete.

39,2. *Eg* omits *in herba*.

39,3. For *Errabam* we find *Errarem* in *Eg* (as in $\alpha\alpha_1$).

39,11. For *agnita* we find *cognita* in $\alpha\alpha_1$.

39,15. For *deuinctus* we find *deuotus* in *Eg* (as in $\alpha\alpha_1$).

39,17. For *vterque* we find *vternis* in $\alpha\alpha_1$ (mentioned by Reedijk without explanation; the intended word is *vteruis*).

39,23. For *Stemmata* we find *Schemmata* in $\alpha\alpha_1$, not *Schemata*, as Reedijk reports.

39,28. For *Faustum* in line 28 Schmidt-Dengler wants us to read *Faustus*, an emendation accepted without comment by W.D. Lebek (p. 310). We are now to interpret the distich as follows (Schmidt-Dengler's translation, p. 311): "Und was macht dein Snger? Mit welchem Werk beneidet Faustus die finsternen Schatten?" This is unintelligible. Keep the reading *Faustum*: it is the object of *inuidet*; the subject of *inuidet* is "he", that is to say, *tuus ille ... vates* (27). "With what sort of literary monument is that poet of yours, Faustus, begrudging himself (*Faustum*) to the black shades of the underworld?" In other words: with what poem is he making himself immortal? Compare Horace, *Carm.* 4,2,21-24:

Flebili sponsae iuuenemue raptum
 Plorat et viris animumque moresque
 Aureos educit in astra nigroque
 Inuidet Orco.

39,40. For *Agresti* we find *Buccolica* in *Eg* (not *Bucolica*, as Reedijk reports).

39,47. For *placidus* we find *placidus* in *Eg*.

39,49. For *tecum* we find *demum* in *Eg*. For *laetabere* in the same line α_1 erroneously reads *latebre*.

39,56. For *plagoso* (*Eg BAS LB*) we find *plagosa* in β and *F*.

39,59. For *arundine* in line 59 *Eg* reads *appolline* (not *Appoline*, as Reedijk reports).

At the end of the poem β prints $\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$.

40. AD ROBERTUM GAGUINUM CARMEN DE SUIS FATIS

In his critical apparatus for this poem Reedijk repeatedly uses the sigla *b* and *B* to mean β .

In *Eg* we find the following heading: *Ad gaguinum de suis etc.* Reedijk misspells the third part of Erasmus' name as it appears in the heading of *S*; it should read: *Rotterdamensis*. As for the heading in β , it does not have the form that Reedijk says it has. The true reading is: *Eiusdem in morbo de fatis suis querela*. This heading reappears in *F BAS LB*.

Though Reedijk uses the title of *S*, he uses β and *F* as his copy texts.

40,6. For *teneras* we find *teneas* in *Eg*.

40,8. For *Nec* we find *Non* in *Eg* (as in *S*).

40,16. On *calidus cum gelido senex* Reedijk writes: "The representation of Saturnus and Ares as old men is uncommon in classical mythology"²⁵. This is true only of Mars, the hot and choleric warrior-god whose very nature demands that he be portrayed as a young man. Saturn, by contrast, was traditionally regarded as an old man. In astrological terms he is the cold planet, associated with melancholy and frigid old age²⁶. Compare for example Ovid, *Ibis* 213-14 (the baleful conjunction of the two malefic planets Mars and Saturn): *te fera nec*

²⁵ This remark is echoed by Schmidt-Dengler, p. 315, note 1: "Ares und Saturn werden in der antiken Mythologie nicht als Greise vorgestellt". Harry C. Schnur, *Lateinische Gedichte deutscher Humanisten* (Stuttgart, 1967), p. 430, knew better: he says only that the "Darstellung des Ares/Mars als Greis in der Antike unbekannt [ist]".

²⁶ See Raymond Klibansky et al., *Saturn and Melancholy. Studies in the History of Natural Philosophy, Religion and Art* (London, 1964), p. 127ff.

quicquam placidum spondentia Martis / sidera presserunt falciferique senis; and Faustus Andrelinus, *Livia* 2,5,18: *In me tota ruit nascentem regia coeli; / Falcifero Mauors cum sene iunctus erat*. The phrase *calidus* ... *senex* therefore cannot be correct. It is both a contradiction in terms (old age, according to the old physiology, is always "cold") and mythologically not true (Mars is not an old man). We should accordingly emend *senex* to *sene* and read: *calidus* [sc. *deus*] *cum gelido sene*, "the hotblooded god and the frigid old man". This emendation is already made in *BAS* and *LB*, neither of which, however, is mentioned by Reedijk.

40,25. For *Sullae* we find *scylle* in *Eg* (not mentioned in Reedijk's apparatus), *Scyllae* in *S* (not *Scylle*, as Reedijk reports), and (*pace* Reedijk) *scyllae* in *β*; *F* has *Scyllae*; *BAS LB* read *Syllae*. Reedijk apparently wanted to emend the spelling here partly because it looks strange to our eyes and partly to avoid confusion with the daughter of Nisus or the sea-monster Scylla. Whether the change is truly necessary is another matter. We should keep in mind the following points. (i) According to Renaissance habits of pronunciation, at least in northern Europe, the consonants *sc* were spoken as an *s*. Hence *scio* sounded like "sio" and *Scythia* as "Sytha" (see Erasmus, *De pronuntiatione*, *ASD* I-4, p. 76, 63-65). (ii) Given this pronunciation it is not surprising that medieval and Renaissance texts sometimes spell the *s*-sound with *sc*. Hence we not only find such forms as *abscons* for *absens* and *scaevus* for *saevus*, but also *Scylla* for *Sylla*. In Erasmus' edition of Willem Hermans' *Sylua odarum* — the same book in which the present poem was first published — we read on fol. d1^v: *fortunatum Marium, Scyllamque beatum, / Scipiadasque duos*²⁷. (iii) Erasmus and his printers nearly

²⁷ The spelling *Scylla* or *Scilla* occurs also, as a variant reading for *Syllae*, in Claudian, *Carm.* 28,383 (ed. Birt); and in Thomas Wright, ed., *The Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets and Epigrammatists of the Twelfth Century* (London, 1872), II, 401, note 2:

Summa rotae dum Croesus habet, tenet infima Codrus;
Iulius ascendit, descendit Magnus, et infra
Sylla [*B*: Scilla] iacet, surgit Marius; sed cardine verso
Sylla [*B*: Scilla] redit, Marius premitur.

See also p. 406, note 2: *Sylla* [*A*: *Scilla*] *nouus, alter Nero*. For such spellings as *abscons* and *abscentia* see, for example, Godelieve Tournoy-Thoen's edition of P. Faustus Andrelinus, *Amores siue Liuia*, *Verhandeligen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren, Jaargang 44*, no. 100 (Brussels, 1982), p. 262; for *scaeva* instead of *saeva* see her apparatus criticus to Andrelinus, *Livia* 3,10,45. See also A. M. M. Dekker (as note 3 above), p. 342: *Scythonia* instead of *Sithonia*.

always spell the name as *Sylla*. As he notes in *De pronuntiatione*, *ASD* I-4, p. 90, 568-70: ... proxymus, optymus, Sylla, *pro quibus nos ... proximus, optimus et Sulla sonamus, quanquam Sylla est vsitatius*. See for instance *ASD* I-2, p. 330, 17; II-5, p. 53, 795; p. 337, lines 227, 228, and 231; II-6, p. 382, 811; and p. 475, 44; IV-1, p. 54, 900; p. 56, 972; p. 275, 333; p. 282, 605; p. 283, 610; p. 310, 614; p. 312, 675 and 681.

40,32. *F* (like β) prints *Alterius*.

40,44. For *quod* we find *quid* in *F*.

40,46. For *Quaeue* we find *Que ne* in *S*.

40,52. For *grauibus* we find *miseris* in *Eg*.

At the end of the poem β prints: $\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$.

43. HENDECASYLLABUM HERASMI AD STUDIOSOS

Reedijk does not record the heading given in the *Epigramm.* of 1506/7 and 1518, except in translation: *In fronte odarum Guielmi* [spelled *Guihelmi* in the 1518 *Epigramm.*].

43,1. *F* reads *siquidem* for *siquem*.

44. IN CASTIGATIONES VINCENTII

44,4. In *Eg* lines 3-4 read as follows:

Hic lacerat mutilatque: hic pannos assuit ostro
Sordidior et mendis pagina nulla vacat

Smith, Ferguson, and Reedijk try to solve the metrical problem in line 4 by taking *Sordidior* to be an adjective modifying the second *hic* in line 3, putting a comma after *Sordidior*, and getting rid of *et*. This is to solve the metrical problem at the expense of meaning. Why indeed should the second *hic* in line 3 be considered a "dirtier fellow" than the first? Other questions arise. How did *et* get inserted into the text? Paleographically it seems more probable that the metrical problem is located in *Sordidior*. If so, we may ask: was the corrupt form *Sordidior* intended as an adjective or a noun? If it is an adjective, does it belong with line 3 or line 4? *Eg* itself appears to indicate that *Sordidior* belongs with line 4, there being no colon to separate it from the following words. The sense pause therefore most likely comes in the line break from 3 to 4. Now if the form intended with *Sordidior* belongs with line 4 it cannot be an adjective. Neither *Sordidis ... mendis* nor *Sordida ... pagina* is possible here: they do not fit the meter or the sense. We should take it as a noun paralleling *mendis* and emend it to *Sordibus*:

Hic lacerat mutilatque, hic pannos assuit ostro;
Sordibus et mendis pagina nulla vacat.

This emendation becomes all the more attractive in view of line 7, where *sordes* is used in precisely the same sense as here. The old editions were filled with *sordibus et mendis* (4); Malleolus tried to emend these *sordes* (7) but only made matters worse.

45. PROSOPOPOEIA BRITANNIAE MAIORIS

In β the heading of this poem is as follows: *Britannia ipsa loquitur / de Regis sui Henrici Septimi deque liberorum illius: deque suis ipsius laudibus: Carmen dicolon / distrophon / hexametro / heroico / Iambicoque / trimetro / alternans. Carmen.* In γ the heading reads: *Erasmi Roterodami de laudibus Britanniae, Regisque Henrici Septimi, ac regionum liberorum, carmine hexametro, et Iambico trimetro acatalectico. Britannia loquitur.* The *Epigramm.* of 1518 and *BAS LB* follow the heading of γ but add *Ode* before *Erasmi*.

As regards orthography and the adoption of variant readings into his text Reedijk, as so often, charts his own course. His text, like Zeuxis' Helen, corresponds to no one model in particular but combines the supposedly best features of each into one idealized form. Thus he borrows the poem's heading from the editio princeps (with some characteristic alterations in spelling) but for good measure adds the subtitle *Britannia loquitur* from γ *F*. The result of this intermingling of textual strata is a tautology foreign to the early editions, since the words *Prosopopoeia Britannie* of α already state clearly that it is Britannia who is speaking. In the poem itself Reedijk prefers on the whole to follow the readings and orthography of one or another of the later editions.

Reedijk mentions in general, but fails to record, the marginalia of α (and some later editions; not in β or γ). They are as follows (cited according to α): 5 *India extrema*; 6 *Arabia*; 7 *Panchaia*; 8 *Hispanie Tagus*²⁸; 9 *Aegypti Nilus*; 10 *Vina Rheni*; 11 *Aphrice fertilitas*; 13 *Anglie dotes*; 17-18 *Temperies anglie*; 19 *Longi dies*; 20 *Noctes lucide*; 21 *Lana anglie*; 23 *Miracula anglie*; 26 *Alter mundus Anglia*; 29 *Regis Henrici laudes*; 31 *Artes belli et pacis*; 33 *Regis moderatio*; 35 *Regis clementia*; 37

²⁸ Schmidt-Dengler, unaware of this sidenote, misunderstands the "river of gold" to be the Guadalquivir (Baetis). But it was the *Tagus* which was proverbial in antiquity for its goldbearing waters; see A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (1890; rpt. Hildesheim, 1971), p. 340, no. 1737.

Regis in patriam pietas; 39 *Regis religio*; 41 *Regis facundia*; 43 *Regis liberalissimi summa sanguinis parsimonia*; 53 *Alludit ad assertum imperium*; 55 *Alludit ad victum eum qui se regis filium ementiebatur*; 57 *Pax anglie*; 59 *Optat regi immortalitatem*; 69 *Laus quinque regis liberorum*; 73 *Comparatio de rosis pescanis* [sic; *F* reads: *pestanis*]; 75 *Rose laudes*; 79 *Rubra rora* [sic; *F* reads: *rosa*] *et alba*; 89 *Rosa Edmondi*; 91 *Rosa Marie*; 93 *Rosa Henrici*; 95 *Rosa Margarete*; 99 *Rosa arcturi*; 105 *Arcturi laus*; 107 *Arcturi indoles*; 109 *Arcturici* [sic; *F* reads: *Arcturi*] *prematura prudentia*; 111 *Dauid puer*; 113 *Salomon puer*; 115 *Margarite laus*; 117 *Vnionis natura*; 129 *Henrici laus*; 135 *Marie laus*; 137 *Elmondi* [sic] *laus*.

45,7. For *Thuriferis* β reads *Turriferis*.

45,21. For *Boeti* (α) we find *Betis* in α_1 β *BAS LB*. *F* writes *Beti*. But a genitive is clearly required here. Read *Boetis* or *Betis*. (Reedijk does write *Boetis* in the note to this line).

Line 21 should end in a semicolon or colon ($\alpha\beta\gamma$ have a period there). Britannia is priding herself on better wool than that raised on the banks of the Baetis (Guadalquivir).

45,31. For *Martisque* β prints *Martique*.

45,35. The semicolon after *putat* marks too long a pause. Replace it with a comma (as in *F BAS LB*) or with a colon (as in α ; β has a virgule here).

45,45. For *semine* in line 45 β reads *sanguine*. The change may be due to contamination with Vergil, *Aen.* 4,191: *venisse Aenean Troiano sanguine cretum*. Erasmus' model, however, is Ennodius 466 (*Dictio* 28, in *MGH*, Auct. antiq. VII, p. 325, 6): *Durus et indomitus* [sc. *Aeneas*] *Veneris se semine cretum* / *Iactat*.

45,72. For *tres* we find *tris* in $\alpha\beta$.

45,74. For *nitentes* *F* erroneously prints *nitentis*.

45,77. For *nexilibus* we find *textilibus* in β .

45,78. *BAS LB* erroneously have *solis* for *solus*.

The rose alone is worthy of being woven into garlands for the Tudors. The erroneous form *dignis* (γ *F BAS LB*) in line 78 should be changed back to *dignus* (sc. *flos*) as in $\alpha\beta$ and the *Epigramm.* of December 1518. None of this is recorded in Reedijk's critical apparatus.

45,84. For *iuuenta* we find *iuventas* in $\alpha\beta$. For *par* β has *pax*.

45,87-88. Reedijk translates as follows: "There are two things that distinguish them [the roses] from one another, bringing about a beautiful contrast between cognate buds: their age and their colour". The clarity of the Latin text will equal that of the translation if we set off *Aetas*

colorque (88) with commas; γ *F BAS LB* have a comma at the end of line 87.

45,89. A comma after *virenti* will separate two main clauses with different subjects and verbs: *Haec ... latet*, and *lucet purpura*. γ *F BAS LB* also have a comma here; $\alpha\beta$ print a colon at the end of the line.

45,95. The verb *exinuauit* of the early editions was misprinted in *BAS* and *LB* as *exinaniuit*. Why Reedijk adopted the late misprint is not clear, especially as this form sins against both meter and sense. Restore *exinuauit* (i.e., *exsinuauit*). Erasmus throughout the passage is taking as his model the famous lines of *De rosis nascentibus* in *Anthol*, *Lat*. 646R, 17-30. Compare in particular lines 15, 25-30:

*Haec viret angusto foliorum tecta galero,
Hanc tenui folio purpura rubra notat.
Haec aperit primi fastigia celsa obelisci,
Mucronem absoluens purpurei capitis,
Vertice collectos illa exsinuabat amictus,
Iam meditans foliis se numerare suis.*

45,99. The critical apparatus is in error. The reading *bis seno* derives from α ; γ *F BAS LB* read *ter seno*.

45,106. For *reddet* α reads *redde*.

45,127. The verse should be put within quotation marks.

45,128. For *iuret* Schmidt-Dengler wishes to read *viret* with $\alpha\alpha_1$, but this form, as Lebek has noted, does not fit the meter.

45,134. For *Thetim* α reads *Tethim*, γ prints *Tethyn*, while β *F BAS LB* have *Thetin*.

45,142-44. The list of fragrant herbs and flowers in lines 143-45 amplifies line 142 *quicquid est odori graminis*. Change the full stop after *graminis* (142) to a colon and the full stop after *amaracum* (144) to a comma. Also add a comma after *Ambrosiam* (143), as in *F BAS LB* ($\alpha\beta\gamma$ have a period there). *Ambrosiam* is a noun, not an adjective.

45,149. In the critical apparatus Reedijk notes that "*S*" writes *candida vellera* for *vellera candida*. The cryptic siglum is meant to be β .

At the end of the poem α has: *Panegyrici finis*; γ has *Finis*. The postscript of α_1 also appears in β .

46. CARMEN EXTEMPORALE

On fol. 6^v of the Egerton manuscript we find the poem's heading as given by Reedijk. On fol. 10^r *Eg* cites only the first three lines of this

poem, but now under a slightly different heading: *Ad Skeltom* [i.e., *Skeltonum*] *carmen extempo[rale]*.

Reedijk classicizes a number of words in *Eg*, writing *Castalidumque* for *Casthalidumque* in line 4; *Apollo* for *appollo* and *chelyn* for *chelim* in line 8; *Hyblaeo* for *hybleo* in line 11; and *Graecia Maeonio* for *Grecia meonio* in line 21.

46,23. Smith, Ferguson, and Reedijk print *Skeltoni*. This is a misreading of *Eg* which in fact writes *Skeltom*. There is, to be sure, a small stroke above the *m*, but this is only a scribal mark occasionally used in *Eg* over both the *n* and the *m*. It is found, for instance, over the *m* in *Auratam* (line 9), over the *m* in *iam* (line 23); over the *m* of *Qum* in 47,1 (whence Smith's reading *quin*); and over the *m* in *Skeltom* (end of the manuscript, as noted above). The form *Skeltom* in line 23 seems to have been intended as an abbreviation for *Skeltonum*. If so it must be a scribal error for *Skeltono*. The name is a *second-declension* noun. Compare *Carm.* 45,130: *Skeltono* (ablative); and *Epist.* 104,64: *Skeltonum* (misspelled in *Eg* as *Skelkonum*).

47. CONTESTATIO SALUATORIS AD HOMINEM SUA CULPA PEREUNTEM

The second part of the heading in *Eg*, which Reedijk (following Smith and Ferguson) cites as *Carminis futuri rudimenta*, in fact reads: *Carminis futuri rudimentum*.

47,1. Read *Qum* (*Eg*).

47,6. *Eg* erroneously writes *hac* for *hanc*.

47,8. Read *qur* (*Eg*).

47,9. In the general introduction (p. 116) Reedijk asserts that "even the future author of the anti-Ciceronian *Dialogus Ciceronianus* should have been wary of expressions like ... *sum facilis dare* (*Carm.* 47,9, *Carm.* 85,26)". But this construction — an adjective governing an infinitive — is a Grecism also found in classical Latin poetry. Compare for instance Prop. 2,21,15: *a nimium faciles aurem praebere puellae*; and especially Lucan. 1,510 (Erasmus' model): *O faciles dare summa deos ...!* See further: *Thes. L.L.* VI,64,30-68; and J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik* (Munich, 1965), II, 350-51.

47,11. Correct *patientia* in line 11 to *sapiencia*, as in *Eg*. For the thought see 1 Cor. 1,30; Prov. 3,19 and 8,22-31; Erasmus, *Carm.* 19,193-94; *Concio de puero Iesu* (LB V, 606 B): *puer ille coelestis, sapientia Dei Patris*; *Modus orandi* (ASD V-1, p. 164,498): *Aeterni Patris*

aeterna sapientia Iesu Christe; *Colloquia* (ASD I-3, p. 174, 1581-82): *aeterna sapientia summi Patris*. Such phrases are traditional. See for instance Paulinus of Nola, *Carm.* 22,135: *dei ... sapientia Christus*; 23,296: *Sapientia patris / ... Christus*; Alcuin, *Carm.* 20,8: *Omnipotens patris virtus, sapientia Christus*; Hrabanus Maurus, *Carm.* 34,1: *Omnipotens, summi patris sapientia, Christe*.

47,13. Read *Preceptor* (Eg).

47,14. Read *Eternitas* (Eg).

47,15. Read *celi* (Eg).

47,17. Read *qum* (Eg).

47,18. Read *Qur* (Eg).

47,20. Read *Qum* (Eg).

47,21. For the construction *Sum ... misereri pronus* which Reedijk finds "unusual" see above, on line 9.

47,27. Read *Preteritum* (Eg) and *reiice* (Eg).

48. LIBELLUS DONO MISSUS

48,1. For *cur* read *quur* (*Epigramm.* of 1506/7 and 1518).

50. IN SEX TINTINABULA

50,3. Nicolaas van der Blom, in *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 1 (1981), 150-52, proposes to emend *Scasti* in line 3 to *Sanctis*. His "chief objection [to *Scasti*]" is that Reedijk did not follow the order of the text. Unconsciously shrinking from the 'administrative' order of the names — which is hardly compatible with a poem — he [Reedijk] inverted the names and rebaptized the worthy bishop as Girardus Scastus instead of 'Scastus, Girardus'" (p. 150). Van der Blom's objection is unfounded. The inversion of first and last names is quite common in Latin poetry, for metrical reasons. Compare for instance *Carm.* 10,2: *Fiscini ... Guihelme*; and *Colloquia* (ASD I-3, p. 415, 144): *Gracchum Tiberium*. With this chief objection disposed of, the rest of van der Blom's arguments can be dismissed as speculation ungrounded in the facts. (a) If the church referred to were indeed the Notre Dame of Chartres, as van der Blom argues, why should Erasmus want to style it *aedem ... sacram Sanctis* ("sacred to [all] the Saints")? (b) Since Erasmus' poem was first published in January of 1507, his *Girardus* can hardly be identified with Erard de la Marck. Erard after all did not succeed René d'Illiers († April 8, 1507) as bishop of Chartres until the

summer of 1507. Is it really probable that the cautious Erasmus would have substituted "Erardi" (= *Girardi*?) for "Renati" while the latter was still alive? (c) The restoration of the tower was not begun until March 1507 and not completed until 1513. Erasmus, however, speaks of both the bells and the church as already restored. Note the perfect tense of both *restituta* in the heading and *restituit* in 50,4. (d) In the early editions the phrase *aedemque sacram* is set off by virgules (ß) or by commas (*Epigramm.* of 1518). The word *sacram* is thus clearly separated from the following word by punctuation at the caesura. See also A. M. M. Dekker, "Twee epigrammen van Erasmus (R. 49,50)", *Hermeneus* 53 (1981), 366-67. His attempt to rescue Van der Blom's emendation by making *Sanctis* the dative object of *restituit* (4) is unconvincing.

60. IN EUNDEM AULICUM

"When you were ranting against the clergy, Ursalus, someone told you that you were violating both Roman and canon law (*ius*). Hereupon you laughed long and hard at the man — and rightly so, for what could be more foolish and trifling than that? — who believed, when one heard the word *ius*, it could mean anything besides the cook's broth (*ius*) you know best of all".

Qui in line 5 is a relative pronoun referring back to *hominem* (3). Line 4 is an interjection: the poet voices his (ironic) agreement with Ursalus' point of view. It should end with a question mark, and dashes should set it off from the rest of the sentence. (The *Epigramm.* of 1506/7 and 1518 as well as *BAS LB* have a question mark at the end of line 4 and a period at the end of line 6).

67.

The poem's heading as given in the *Epigramm.* of 1506/7 and 1518 is not recorded by Reedijk, except in translation: *In fronte libelli de imperatoria maiestate.*

70.

The poem's meter is not "decasyllabic Alcaic" (two dactyls plus two trochees), as Reedijk believed. The pattern here is three dactyls and a final syllable, in other words a dactylic tetrameter catalectic *in syllabam*. See for example Prudentius, *Cath.* 3.

78. ILLUSTRISSIMO PRINCIPI PHILIPPO FELICITER IN PATRIAM REDEUNTI
GRATULATORIUM CARMEN

78,2. The line should end with an exclamation mark, not a comma.

78,15. After *Sospes* a comma is required, as in ε *BAS LB*; α has a colon there.

78,20. Correct *enim* to *etiam*, as in αε *BAS LB*.

78,49-50. Lines 50-51 depend on the preceding sentence. Change the full stop (αε *BAS*) after *pererras* (49) to a comma, as in *LB*. Also, since *Illarum* belongs with *rerum* in line 50, drop the commas around *ac pro rerum pondere*.

78,65. The line should end with a quotation mark. In line 66 *Patria* returns to her own voice. (The quotation mark which Reedijk puts at the end of the poem should be removed).

78,74. The form *fecunda*, which in any case does not fit the meter, is a misreading for *secunda* (so in αε *BAS LB*): Burgundy is second to none, save only the gods.

78,95. Correct *immitere* to *immittere* (as in αε *BAS LB*).

At the end of the poem ε has: *Finis*.

82. ARX VULGO DICTA HAMMENSIS

At the end of the poem the *Epigramm.* of 1506/7 has: Τελος.

83. DE SENECTUTE CARMEN

Reedijk neglects to give the poem's heading as it appears in the editio princeps (β): *Ad gulielmum Copum Basiliensem artis medicae principiem [sic] Erasmi Roterodami Carmen de fuga vitae humanae*. In δ we find the following heading: *Erasmi Roterodami ad Gulielmum Copum Basiliensem De senectutis incommodis, Heroico carmine, et Iambico dimetro catalectico*. In the 1518 *Epigrammata* the heading reads: *Des. Erasmi Roterodami Carmen ad Guilielmum Copum Basileiensem de senectutis incommo-dis, heroico carmine, et iambico dimetro catalectico*.

83,15. β omits *secum* and writes *vexerat* for *vexerit*.

83,27. For *insculpta* (β) we find *inscalpta* in δ, the *Epigramm.* of 1518, and *BAS LB*.

83,51. The full stop at the end of the line (*Epigramm.* of 1518) should be changed to a comma (so: δ *BAS LB* Meissinger Schmidt-Dengler; β has a colon there).

83,97. *impiger* belongs with *carpo*, not with *voluor* which already has *sedulus* (96). Drop the comma after *impiger* (δ) and put it instead after *genus* (so too: *Epigramm.* of 1518, *BAS LB Meissinger*; β has a virgule there)²⁹.

83,124-25. *Spires* in lines 124 and 125, as Reedijk notes in the critical apparatus, derives from *BAS* and *LB*, not from the earlier editions, whether or not printed under Erasmus' supervision. These (including the 1518 *Epigrammata*, not mentioned in Reedijk's apparatus) all write *speres*. Which reading should be adopted in a new critical edition? Normally one does not hesitate to retain a reading which makes sense and is found over and over again, even in editions presumably corrected by the author himself. And Erasmus over the years had ample opportunity to change *speres* to *spires* had he wanted to. But he did not. We will therefore want strong proof — not provided by Reedijk — that it was indeed *spires* that was intended, and that *speres* was simply an oversight, a printer's error which was consistently overlooked in subsequent reprintings and not corrected until *BAS* and *LB*.

It should first of all be pointed out that Erasmus is alluding to the proverb cited by St. Jerome, *Contra Rufinum* 1,17 (ed. P. Lardet, *CCL* 79 [1982], p. 16): *Quamuis Croesos quis spiret aut Dareos, litterae marsupium non sequuntur*. For the form *spiret* in Jerome's text there is apparently no variant reading *speret* which might have accounted for that form in *Carm.* 83. Moreover: Erasmus' edition of Jerome's *Opera* (Basel, 1516), III, fol. 92 C also gives *spiret*, as does his *Adagia* 1,6,74 (in the Aldine edition of September 1508 and the Basel-edition of 1520; also *LB* II, 251 E). This evidence reveals that Erasmus, at least from 1508 on, was aware that the correct reading of *Carm.* 83,124-25 had to be *spires* but never reread his poem so closely as to make the necessary correction.

83,131 and 141. Lines 126-41 form one long sentence. The full stop at the end of line 131 should be changed to a comma; the comma at the end of line 141 should become a full stop (so too: βδ, *Epigramm.* of 1518, *BAS LB*).

83,139. For *per Chias* β reads *aequoreas*, not *equoreas* as Reedijk notes in the critical apparatus.

83,141. For *Omneis admoueāt* β reads *Omnis admoneāt*. The non-

²⁹ Margolin and Schmidt-Dengler follow Reedijk's punctuation. Pierre Laurens, *Musae reduces* (above, note 23), II, 114-15, puts a comma before and after *impiger* and translates correctly.

word *proferit* in the same line derives from the *Epigramm.* of March 1518. This is a printing error for *proserit* (so in the early editions, as well as in the *Epigramm.* of December 1518 and *BAS LB*).

83,142. The spelling *anulus* for Reedijk's *annulus* is also found in the *Epigramm.* of 1518 and in *BAS LB*.

83,143. Lines 142-43 comprise a new sentence. In contrast to the subjunctives of the preceding clauses we now find the indicative: *remorantur*. The comma at the end of line 143 should therefore be changed to a full stop (as in βδ, *Epigramm.* of 1518, *BAS LB*) since the sentence does not run on into line 144.

83,144. *Atque* is a misprint for *Atqui* (so in the early editions and *BAS LB*).

83,185. In the course of this *meditatio senectutis* — it is essentially a Renaissance version of the medieval *contemptus-mundi* theme cast in the form of a Christian *carpe-diem* ode — Erasmus poses as an everyman who, at the midpoint of life, is just now beginning to realize that youth is a fleeting treasure which he should not have allowed to slip away idly. How unthinkingly has he spent his youthful years, with never a care for the future! Now, however, that he is on the threshold of manhood and old age, he regretfully looks back at his life thus wasted on trifles and reflects: "But now — to what mere trifles, alas! have I, heedlessly slumbering, been devoting so great a part of my life? Enough of this torpor, wretched Erasmus! You have dozed long enough! Now, now is the time to fend off sleep, to rouse yourself, to come with heart and soul to your senses!"

Line 185 should end in a question mark or an exclamation mark. The comma at the caesura of the line — there is no punctuation here in β — should be removed since *Qualibus ... nugis* is the indirect object of *est data*, and *mihi oscitanti* (184) is the dative of agent.

83,187. The line, as Perosa and Sparrow point out, is incomplete; the early editions and *BAS LB* read: *satis est dormitum*.

83,193. The reading *et* (βγ) for *vt* is also found in the *Epigramm.* of 1518 and *BAS LB*.

83,213. A full stop is required after *sequamur* (as in δ, *Epigramm.* of 1518, *BAS LB*).

83,219. For *hinc* β reads *huic*.

83,234. For *Hippoclidem* δ reads *Hippoclidem*.

83,238. Correct the unmetrical form *Niteat* to *Niteatque* (Hutton, Perosa-Sparrow), as in the early editions and *BAS LB*.

83,244. The reading *restitutor* for *vindicator* is also found in the 1518 *Epigrammata*.

At the end of the poem β has: $\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$; δ prints: *Finis*.

84. EPITAPHIUM SCURRULAE TEMULENTI

In the heading of α *scurrulae* is spelled as *Scurulae*; this spelling is also found in line 5 of this edition: *Scurula*.

84,13. The form *sommiare* is a misprint for *somniare* (α , *Epigramm.* of 1518, *BAS LB*).

85. EXPOSTULATIO IESU CUM HOMINE SUAPTE CULPA PEREUNTE

The *Progymnastica* (1521), an edition authorized by Erasmus, provides a series of sidenotes which are not recorded by Reedijk. They are as follows: 5 *Deum negligunt*; 11 *Formosi*; 13 *Nobiles*; 19 *Christus est monarcha*; 21 *Diues*; 23 *Sapientia*; 25 *Splendor patris*; 27 *Amicus candidus*; 31 *Via*; 33 *Veritas*; 35 *Fidelis*; 37 *Vita*; 39 *Lux*; 40 *Dux*; 41 *Regula vitae*; 43 *Voluptas*; 45 *Pax*; 47 *Nobis bene fecit*; 57 *Dominus*; 61 *Summum bonum*; 65 *Misericors*; 69 *Potens*; 75 *Charitas*; 77 *Benignitas*; 79 *Spes vitae*; 81 *Timor poenae*.

85,4. For *vndeuis* α prints *vdenis*.

85,61. After *ego* insert *hic*, as in the early editions.

85,73. The variant reading *Pretectum* for *Praeteritum* is found not just in β as Reedijk indicates, but already in α .

85,79. Reedijk, contrary to his usual practice of adopting the reading of the later authoritative version, writes *spes vel* (α) rather than *vel spes* (*Epigramm.* of 1518; *Progymnastica* of 1521; *BAS LB*). This variant is not listed in Reedijk's critical apparatus.

85,82. The variant *admoneat* for *admonet* is first found in α .

At the end of the poem the *Progymnastica* of 1521 prints: *Finis*.

88. CARMEN IAMBICUM

The *Progymnasmata* (1521) and *BAS LB* give a subtitle not recorded by Reedijk: *Sub persona pueri Iesu praesidentis scholae Coleticae*.

88,6. The reading *virgineae* (α) is changed in the later editions to *virgineo* (*Epigramm.* of 1518, *Progymnasmata* of 1521, *BAS LB*) but Reedijk does not note this.

88,14. α *BAS LB* read *Nil* while the *Epigramm.* of 1518 and the *Progymnasmata* of 1521 read *Nihil*.

88,15. In the apparatus criticus to this poem Reedijk twice lists variants of *literarum* and once of *litteratores* where α has a double *t*. (See also the apparatus for *Carm.* 86 and 90,15). Such meticulousness appears impressive until one compares Reedijk's text with that of the original and realizes that he has listed only some of the orthographic changes he has wrought on the editio princeps. The change from *e* to *ae*, for example, goes unmentioned throughout, at least in this series of poems (elsewhere Reedijk occasionally lists such changes). But even in the case of *litterae* he is not consistent. Thus he fails to note that in line 15 α reads: ... *illitteratas litteras*. Similarly, 90,6 *Literas* is spelled *Litteras* in α .

At the end of the poem the *Progymnasmata* (1521) writes *Finis*.

90. SAPPHICUM

90,14. For *mixta* (α) the *Epigramm.* of 1518 and *BAS LB* read *iuxta*.

91. CARMEN IAMBICUM AD ANDREAM AMMONIUM LUCENSEM

91,20. The form *iucunditas* is found not only in the manuscript, as Reedijk tells us, but also in *F BAS* and *LB I*, 1224 D.

93. IN FUGAM GALLORUM INSEQUENTIBUS ANGLIS APUD MORINUM

93,8. *timidē* is not an adverb, but an adjective with *Galle*. Drop the comma after *timide* and put it instead after *aciem*.

93,14. Reedijk's *potest non*, taken from the later editions, does not scan. The correct reading is that of the manuscript and β : *Cato mutare non potest vultum*.

94. CHRISTIANI HOMINIS INSTITUTUM

94,28. For *rursum* the *Epigramm.* of 1518 reads *sursum*.

94,92. A comma is required after *semper*, as in Σ , *Epigramm.* of 1518, and *BAS LB*, since the plural noun *epulae* cannot be directly associated with the singular verb *placebit*. In the same line *mensae* is the genitive object of *Sobria mundities* (93); line 92 runs on into 93 and should not end with a full pause (there is no punctuation here in Σ , *Epigramm.* of 1518, and *BAS LB*).

94,116. For *rursus* in line 116 the *Epigramm.* of 1518 reads *rursusque*.

95. AD SEBASTIANUM BRANT

95,10. For *Illustrans* (α *F BAS*) *LB* reads *Illustras*.

96. AD THOMAM DIDYMU AUCUPARIUM

The editio princeps prints *Didimum* in the heading, *Didime* in line 1.

96,4. Reedijk has forgotten the preposition *e* before *pectore natae* (so in α *F BAS LB*).

97. AD IOANNEM SAPIDUM SUUM

The heading in *Go* is as follows: *Tetrastichon Erasmi ad Ioannem Sapidum in discessu suo ab Vrbe Basilaee*.

98. ENCOMIUM SELESTADII

98,21. A comma is required at the end of the line, as in *F BAS LB*.

99. EPITAPHIUM PHILIPPI COENOBITAE CLUNIACENSIS

99,1. For *libet* the *Epigramm.* of 1518 and *BAS LB* read *lubet*.

99,11. As Reedijk has noted, the line is incomplete. In a note published elsewhere I have tried to show that the word left out in all the editions must have been *amictum*³⁰. Read the final four lines as follows:

Cuius tam niuei fuere mores,
Cui tam candida sit peracta vita,
Huius funera non puto decere
Aut pulla, aut lachrymis nigrandum <amictum>.

Compare Erasmus' translation of Euripides, *Iphig. in Aul.* (*ASD* I-1, p. 349, 2057-58): *Ne tu capillis igitur euulsis comam / Laniaris aut pullos amictus sumpseris*.

100. PRECATIO SALVE MARIA

The heading of this poem as reprinted by Reedijk is incorrect. *CB* reads: *Erasmi Precatio Salve regina*.

³⁰ See: "A Verse of Erasmus' Restored: Carm. 99,11", *Daphnis*, 15 (1986), 123-24.

102.

After *non minus* in the heading of this poem Reedijk has forgotten the word *odioso* (*F BAS LB*). Also correct *ante* to *antea*.

103.

In the heading of this poem delete the full stop after *Guilielmo*, which clearly belongs with *Neseno*. The *Epigramm.* of 1518, *BAS*, and *LB* have no punctuation there.

103,1. In the 1518 *Epigrammata* (also *BAS LB*) the adverb *tot* is set off by commas. Of these Reedijk has retained only the second one. There is good reason for retaining the first comma which sets off the appositive phrase *Tantillus calamus* and marks the caesura, but there is none for keeping the second.

105. DESI. ERASMUS ROTERO. LECTORI

105,8 and 18. Why does Reedijk change the Renaissance spelling *caelsaque* (8) to *celsaque* and *Medaea* (18) to *Medea* but not *cygnaeo* (30) to *cygneo*?

105,11. Reedijk, misreading *reserans* as *referans*, compounds his error by emending it to *referens*. But both the edition of 1540 (cited by Reedijk) and the one printed *Compluti. M.D.XLI. Mense Septembri* have *reserans*³¹. The meaning is clear: Gomez, in bringing to light the origins of the Order of the Golden Fleece, has unlocked the mysteries of the past. For this use of *reserans* compare for example Val. Flacc. 2,438: *sacerdos / ... hospitibus reserans secreta Thyotes*.

105,26. The verb *cantat* in line 30 governs a series of direct objects, beginning with *miracula* in line 20. For this reason the full stop at the end of line 26 (so in the editio princeps and the 1541-reprint) should be changed to a comma. (Both early editions also put a period at the end of lines 22, 30, and 31 where Reedijk in each case writes a comma).

105,31. The sentence of which *cantat* is the main verb concludes with line 31³². This line should end with a full stop, as in the editio princeps and the 1541-reprint.

³¹ The 1541 edition (a copy of which is located in the New York State Library, Albany) was unknown to Kossmann and Reedijk. The phrase *reserans exordia* is understood correctly by F. Kossmann, "Een vergeten lofdicht van Erasmus op de Orde van het Gulden Vlies door Alvar Gomez 1517", *Het Boek*, 26 (1942), p. 363: "Gomez [heeft] ... die feiten van den oorsprong der orde af ... ontruikt aan de vergetelheid".

³² Kossmann, p. 363, lets the sentence end with line 30. But line 31 belongs without a doubt to the preceding sentence.

105,33. In the last sentence of the poem, lines 32-37, *vt* (32) correlates with *Sic* (34). Just as a poem written by a Spaniard has illuminated the history of the Order (founded by a Burgundian, Philip the Good), so too King Charles' valor in war will become renowned throughout the world when the Spanish lance is allied with Burgundian pikes. To convey this meaning in the Latin text we should change the period at the end of line 33 to a comma, as in the 1540 and 1541 editions.

108. IN BRUNONEM AMERBACHII

108,1. In the headnote to this poem Reedijk declares that "as we may be fairly sure that Erasmus himself prepared his texts for the printing of α we have given it precedence over the ms, except for the variant in line 1". He is referring to the manuscript reading *praereptus* which in α has been changed to *ereptus*. Reedijk gives no reason for this inconsistency. Perhaps he was looking at line four where the same word occurs, *ereptae*. But Erasmus no doubt changed *praereptus* in order to avoid the tautology in *ante diem ... praereptus*: "snatched away prematurely, before his time". The reading *ereptus* should be restored. For the phrase *fatis ereptus* compare Ovid, *Met.* 1,358 (in the same metrical position): *fatis erepta*.

109. DE CONCORDIA CAROLI IMPERATORIS ET HENRICI REGIS ANGLIAE ET FRANCIAE

109,4. *Iam* is a misreading of *Tam* (so in the Codex Horawitzianus and Horawitz' edition).

109,8. *Iouem* is in the wrong case: it ought to be in the dative following *adiunctum* and modified by *benigno*. Read: *Solem benigno cernat adiunctum Ioui*. Now the line parallels both lines 6 and 7. The sun, in conjunction with either one of the beneficent planets Venus and Jupiter, brings the world great blessings³³.

³³ See, for instance, Marsilius Ficinus, *De vita libri tres* (Venice, 1498; rpt. Hildesheim, 1978), III,5, fol. n1^v: the planets Venus, Jupiter, and sun are said to be like *gratiae tres inter se concordēs, atque coniunctae. Ab his quidem tribus coeli gratiis et a stellis eiusdem generis astrologi gratias et sperant, et diligenter exquirunt*.

Metrically, of course, it would also be possible to emend the line to *Soli ... Iouem*. Such an emendation, however, would spoil the parallelism of accusative subjects in lines 7 and 8 as well as the parallelism in structure between lines 6 and 8 and would ruin the chiasmic arrangement *Veneri Solem — vel ... Solem ... Ioui*. The emendation to *Soli* would furthermore result in the inconcinnity *si / Soli* and the inartistic arrangement of adjective-noun in *Soli benigno* and *adiunctum Iouem*.

114. IN IACOBUM

114,3. The meaning of the epitaph is as follows: "While you, James, were rejoicing that [Martin] van Dorp was sitting down at the tables of the heaven-dwellers, he called you to the same place. Just so we, in our turn, now rejoice that it was also granted to you to sit down at the tables of the heaven-dwellers". In the editio princeps commas are placed before and after *Datum esse* (4), but Reedijk has retained the first one only. This comma (end of line 3) now separates *Datum esse* (4) from its dative object *tibi* and should therefore be deleted.

118.

118,7-8. By studying the stars we can return to our true fatherland, heaven. *Astra*, at the beginning of line 8, is to be understood as in apposition to *patriam* (7). Put a comma at the end of line 7 and a colon after *Astra* in line 8.

129. EPITAPHIUM ANTONII CLAUAE

The poem is a dialogue between the persona and the deceased. The words of the dead man should be placed within quotation marks.

129,7. A full stop, not a comma, is required at the end of the line.

131. DIUAE GENOUFAE CARMEN VOTIUM

131,13. Read *brachia* (Fr BAS LB). Compare line 84 below: *brachia*.

131,43. Correct *referent* to *reserent*, as in Fr BAS LB. For the phrase *reserent oracula* compare Ovid, *Met.* 15,145: ... *augustae reserabo oracula mentis*; and see above, on *Carm.* 105,11.

131,49. Read *millibus* (Fr BAS LB).

134.

The heading *Erasmus loquitur* does not appear in the editio princeps.

134,3. A colon is needed at the end of the line (the editio princeps and BAS LB have a period there).

The model for this epigram is Martial 7,85,3-4: *facile est epigrammata belle / scribere, sed librum scribere difficile est*.

135. EPITAPHIUM VDALRICI ZASII

135,9. End the line with a question mark.

135,13. For *Exstant* (LB) the manuscript and BAS have *Extant*.

136.

136,3. Read: *Huius si posses sex, octo, decemue parare*.

* * *

In the following I discuss poems printed in Appendix I and II of Dr. Reedijk's edition (pp. 391-94).

APP. I,4. FROM THE COLLOQUY CONUIVIUM POETICUM

The first verse of Hilarius' variation is metrically corrupt, both in Reedijk's text (p. 386) and in ASD I-3, p. 357, 421. For *Cui renidet hortus vndiquaque* [vndique, in ASD] read: *Cui renidet hortus vndiquaque flosculis*.

APP. I,6. FROM THE LORETO LITURGY

Reedijk here follows the Renaissance punctuation, sometimes too closely. Since L.-E. Halkin, in ASD V-1, p. 98, has explicitly adopted this punctuation the following improvements apply to his text as well. (The line references are to the ASD edition; inexplicably there is no line numbering in Reedijk's version).

Lines 37-38 should read: *Martyr carnificem vincit, et edomat / Carnem virgo: decet laurus et hunc et hanc*. The subject of *edomat* is *virgo*. Compare *Virginis et martyris comparatio* (LB V, 596 D): *Martyr patitur a carnifice caedi carnem suam: Virgo quotidie volens mortificat carnem suam*.

The comma after *vnico* in line 41 should be dropped (as in LB) since *Nato ... vnico* belongs with *gratior* (42).

APP. II,1. EUROPA AND THE MONKS

1,1,2. *callidius* is a misprint for *callidus* (Ferguson).

1,2,1. Lines 1 and 2 address Europa, now the dirty whore of the priests, but in times past the illustrious mistress of the one Jupiter (i.e.,

the bride of Christ). The name *Europa* in line 1 should be set off by commas. Also drop the comma after *puella* ("mistress"): it is modified by the adjective *Inclita* and governs the genitive object *Iouis*.

1,2,4. *luxata* is a past participle of the verb *luxo*, not *luxor* as Reedijk indicates in his note.

1,3,2. The regions mentioned in line 3 are in apposition to the *dotes* of line. The full stop at the end of line 2 should be changed to a comma.

APP. II,2. JULIUS II (F-VERSION)

When Reedijk published his dissertation in 1956 he had not been able "to trace the original manuscript" of this epigram on Julius II and hence was forced to rely on Ferguson's text. In the next year, however, good fortune gave him access to a manuscript which he soon recognized to be in Erasmus' hand and indeed almost certainly composed by Erasmus. He was thus able to correct Ferguson's text and his own in several places³⁴:

In the manuscript the poem has the heading *Carmen iambicum*.

2,11. For *pestis ... maximus* read *pestis ... maxima*.

2,13. For *altrix criminum* read *vltrix criminum*. This is undoubtedly the correct reading. The Furies (Erinyes) are the avengers of crimes, the tormentors of conscience. As Folly in the *Moriae encomium* says of these *dirae vltrices: nocentem et conscium animum furiis ac terliculorum facibus agunt* (ASD IV-3, p. 118, 877). This very phrase — *nocentem et conscium animum furiis ... agunt* — recurs in slight variation in the present epigram: *pectus illi Erynnis ... / Furiis agebat*, also with a reference to *mens ... scelerum conscia*. Compare Seneca, *Medea* 13: *sceleris vltrices deae*; *Octavia* 619: *Vltrix Erinys*; Boethius, *Cons.* 3, M. 12,31-32: *quae sontes agitant metu / vltrices scelerum deae*; Vergil, *Aen.* 4,473 *vltrices ... Dirae*; 4,610: *Dirae vltrices*; etc. Erasmus too speaks of the *Erinnyes* as *malefactorum vltrices* (*Adagia* 2,9,15, in *LB* II, 667 A) and associates them with the torments of conscience. It is in this context that he mentions the *vltricibus diris* in his *De contemptu mundi* (ASD V-1, p. 72,

³⁴ C. Reedijk, "Een schimpdicht van Erasmus op Julius II", *Opstellen door vrienden en collega's aangeboden aan Dr. F.K.H. Kossmann* ('s-Gravenhage, 1958), 186-207. A facsimile of the manuscript is inserted between pp. 200 and 201; a new text is established on pp. 202-04. The manuscript is also reproduced in: *Erasmus en zijn tijd. Tentoonstelling ingericht ter herdenking van de geboorte, 500 jaar geleden, van Erasmus te Rotterdam in de nacht van 27 op 28 oktober* (Rotterdam, 1969), II, nr. 148; there is a translation into Dutch (by N. van der Blom) in volume I, no. 178.

884) and the *diris et vltricibus Furiis* in *Adagia* 1,10,91 (*LB* II, 394 E). And in *Lingua* (*ASD* IV-1, p. 281, 560-62) he recalls what the ancients have said of the torments of conscience sent by the avenging Furies: *Veteres dicebant eos qui patrassent homicidium, aut aliud impium facinus, a diris vltricibus agitari.*

2,15. For the unmetrical *Torua erat illi et* now read *Torua erat et illi.*

2,23-24. These lines, as Dr. Reedijk points out in his article, belong after line 9.

APP. II,2. JULIUS II (G-VERSION)

2,13. Change the colon after *hoc* to a comma; *hoc* is the subject of *abest* in line 14. Compare version F, lines 21-22.

APP. II,3. THE SONG OF THE PIGS

3,4. For *sophista* Ferguson reads *sophistica*.

The Ohio State University,
Department of German

Judith Rice HENDERSON

DESPAUTERIUS' *SYNTAXIS* (1509)
THE EARLIEST PUBLICATION OF ERASMUS'
DE CONSCRIBENDIS EPISTOLIS

In the preface to a revised edition of his *Absolutissimus de octo orationis partium constructione libellus* (Basel: J. Froben, August 1515), Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam complained that someone had quoted extensively from a corrupt manuscript of his work-in-progress on letter-writing as if it had already been published: *Alius quispiam ex pauculis paginis iisque deprauatissime scriptis, velut ex opere edito, dictu mirum quam multa citet et inculcet de ratione conscribendarum epistolarum*¹. As Erasmus scholars have recognized since 1913, the reference must be to the Flemish grammarian Johannes Despauterius, whose discussions of letter-writing in *Syntaxis* (Paris: J. Bade, 25 October 1509) and *Ars epistolica* (Paris: J. Bade, 24 June 1513) drew not only from classical rhetoric and the published treatises of such contemporaries as Josse Bade, Heinrich Bebel, and the Italian humanists Agostino Dati, Francesco Negro, Giovanni Sulpizio, Niccolò Perotti, and Antonio Mancinelli, but also from a manuscript draft of Erasmus' *Opus de conscribendis epistolis* (Basel: J. Froben, August 1522)². Henry de

¹ *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, ed. P. S. Allen, et al., 12 vols. (Oxford 1906-58; hereafter cited as Allen), Ep. 341.

² Allen reported in 1913, "Traces of the original draft of the *De conscribendis epistolis* appear in Despauterius' *Ars epistolica*, Paris, J. Badius, 24 June 1513" (III xxiii). No doubt he was alerted by the full title of the work: *Ars epistolica Joannis Despauterii Ninivite ex Dato, Sulpitio, Nigro, Herasmo, Badio, Bebelio et ipso Cicerone, caeterisque vere Latinis diligenter excerpta multo copiosius quam post Syntaxin habeatur*. The title also makes clear, and Alphonse Roersch recognized in his article on Despauterius in *Biographie nationale*, XXIII (Brussels 1921-24), cols. 303-12, that *Ars epistolica* is a revision of the section on letter-writing in Despauterius' *Syntaxis*. However, Roersch was unable to discover a copy of the first edition of *Syntaxis*; he saw only that published by Matthias Schürer at Strasbourg in July 1515. Earlier, Philippe Renouard had mentioned Despauterius' other sources in *Ars epistolica* in studying his borrowings from Bade (see *Bibliographie ... de Josse Badius Ascensius*, Paris 1908, I 110). He also guessed that Bade had printed the *Syntaxis* in 1513 (*Ibid.*, II 395-96). More recently, copies of the *Syntaxis* as published by

Vocht, Jean-Claude Margolin, Maria Cytowska, and Léon-E. Halkin have all mentioned Despauterius' citations of Erasmus, and Alain Jolidon has rightly suggested that they might provide clues to unravel the complex composition history of Erasmus' *Opus de conscribendis epistolis*, but as far as I am aware, none of these scholars has studied Despauterius' treatises in detail³. I too neglected to do so for a previous article on Erasmus' *Opus de conscribendis epistolis*⁴. However, in subsequent work on the history of letter-writing theory and practice in the Renaissance, I have discovered that Despauterius is an important source of information not only on the composition history of Erasmus' treatise but also on the development of Erasmus' opposition to Italian Ciceronianism, which now appears to predate his sojourn in Italy (1506-1509). Despauterius' treatises also offer new evidence about Erasmus' place in humanist circles at Louvain and Paris during one of the most poorly documented periods of his life. Finally, a study of their publication history and influence proves that Erasmus' ideas on letter-writing were widely known more than a decade before the authorized edition of the *Opus de conscribendis epistolis* was published in 1522. Not only were Despauterius' treatises frequently reprinted, but his *Ars epistolica* was used extensively in the syntax of another Flemish grammarian, Petrus Pontanus. Since the first edition of Despauterius' *Syntaxis* is very rare, I publish here his citations of Erasmus' manuscript on letter-writing and his brief commentary on it⁵.

Bade in 1509, 1511, and 1513 have been reported extant: *Imprimeurs et libraires parisiens du XVI^e siècle, ouvrage publié d'après les manuscrits de Philippe Renouard*, II (Paris 1969), nos. 105, 222 bis; Brigitte Moreau, *Inventaire chronologique des éditions parisiennes du XVI^e siècle d'après les manuscrits de Philippe Renouard*, (Paris 1972-77), I, no. 67; II, nos. 71, 74, 562.

³ De Vocht, *History of the Foundation and the Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense 1517-1550* (Louvain 1951-55; hereafter cited as HCT), I 211; Margolin, ed. *De conscribendis epistolis*, in *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami* (Amsterdam 1969-; hereafter cited as ASD), I-2 164-5; Cytowska, ed. *Libellus de constructione octo partium orationis*, in ASD I-4 120 n. 26; Halkin, "Le traité d'art épistolaire d'Érasme", *Moreana* XXI no. 82 (June 1984), 25-32, and *Erasmus ex Erasmo* (Aubel 1983), p. 124; Jolidon, "L'évolution psychologique et littéraire d'Érasme d'après les variantes du 'De conscribendis epistolis'", in *Acta conventus neo-Latini Amstelodamensis*, ed. P. Tuynman, G. C. Kuiper, and E. Keßler (Munich 1979), pp. 566-87, esp. p. 566.

⁴ "Erasmus on the Art of Letter-Writing", in *Renaissance Eloquence*, ed. James J. Murphy (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1983), pp. 331-55.

⁵ The only known copy is in the Stiftsbibliothek Klosterneuburg, Austria. I am grateful to this library for supplying me with a photocopy of the treatise and to Professor Dr. Heinrich Plett of the University of Essen for contacting the library by telephone for me after my first request was lost in the post. Professor P. M. Swan in the Department of

Introduction

Erasmus' *Opus de conscribendis epistolis* originated in his private teaching in Paris between 1495 and 1499. From Erasmus' own remarks in the preface to the authorized edition (Ep. 1284), we learn that he originally produced a simple manual at the request of his pupil Robert Fisher, who was leaving for Italy in 1498 (Ep. 71). Erasmus' letters record that he continued to work on it until 27 January 1501 with the intention of dedicating it to Adolph of Burgundy, Lord of Veere, the pupil of his friend Jacob Batt (Epp. 95, 130, 138, 145). At some stage in the composition he also sent a revision to William Blount, Lord Mountjoy, who had been another of his pupils at Paris (Ep. 117). Allen dates the dedicatory letter to Mountjoy November 1499, but he admits, and Jacques Chomarat has reminded us, that a date of 1509 is possible⁶. At that time, as Allen says, Erasmus had just returned from Italy "to England to find Mountjoy recently married again ... and much engaged in business ... and ... his *vetus amor* for good learning would have been both surprising and welcome to his old tutor". The evidence of Despauterius' *Syntaxis* shows that Erasmus had by that time completed a substantial revision of his treatise on letter-writing; no doubt he would have been looking for a patron for it. We then hear no more of the treatise in Erasmus' letters until about November 1511, when he once more claimed to be revising it (Ep. 241). Beatus Rhenanus in a letter from Basel written 30 April 1515 (Ep. 330) reminded Erasmus to finish the treatise for publication by Froben, but Erasmus succeeded in doing so only after two works on letter-writing had appeared in pirated editions under his name. The *Brevissima maximeque compendiarie conficiendarum epistolarum formula* was perhaps printed first at Basel by Adam Petri late in 1519 or early in 1520, according to a recent argument by R. A. B. Mynors⁷. The first extant editions were published at Erfurt,

History, University of Saskatchewan, and Professor Charles Fantazzi in the Department of Classical and Modern Languages, University of Windsor, have kindly assisted me with a variety of editing problems. The responsibility for any errors is my own. Finally, I could not have completed this project without a sabbatical leave from the University of Saskatchewan and generous funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

⁶ Chomarat, *Grammaire et rhétorique chez Érasme* (Paris 1981), II 1006 n. 16.

⁷ Introductory note to *Conficiendarum epistolarum formula*, trans. and annotated Charles Fantazzi, in *Collected Works of Erasmus* (Toronto 1974-; hereafter cited as CWE), XXV-XXVI 256-57.

Leipzig, and Mainz in 1520. The relation of this work to the *Opus de conscribendis epistolis* remains enigmatic. The *Libellus de conscribendis epistolis*, which is clearly an early draft of the *Opus de conscribendis epistolis*, was published at Cambridge by John Siberch in 1521. In a carefully documented argument, Jolidon has suggested that the *Libellus* is a revision of the draft sent to Fisher and was completed between May 1499 and September 1500, while the *Brevissima formula* is slightly later, written around 1500⁸.

A comparison of the *Libellus de conscribendis epistolis* and Despaute-rius' *Syntaxis* with the authorized *Opus de conscribendis epistolis* shows two of the early stages in the composition of the treatise. The *Libellus* opens with some brief remarks on style in the letter, but it is largely devoted to a discussion and illustration of particular types of letters⁹. As in the authorized edition, Erasmus first distinguishes between letters that treat many subjects (*mixtae*) and those that have a single subject or purpose. To classify the latter, he borrows the categories of the oration. Thus letters are divided into three *genera*: 1) *deliberativum* (*exhortatio, dehortatio, suasio, dissuasio, consolatio, petitio, commendatio, monitio, amatoria*); 2) *demonstrativum* (*descriptiones personarum, urbium, agrorum, regionum, animalium, aedificiorum, temporum, montium*); or 3) *judiciale* (*criminatio, defensio, expostulatio, purgatio, exprobratio, invec-tiva, deprecatio*). The types of letters not covered by these categories he labels *extraordinarium* (*nuntiatio, commissio aut mandatio, narratio, col-laudatio, gratiarum actio, querela, lamentatio, gratulatio, jocus*). Erasmus discusses the handling of each type of letter and provides examples. In the authorized edition he will expand the discussion and add numerous illustrations, but the *Libellus* contains, in draft, the argument of the last three-quarters of the finished treatise, beginning with the chapter entitled *De ordine epistolari* (ASD I-2 301-579). It also has, in the introductory remarks on style, some of the cautions about excessive flattery in the salutation that are found in the authorized edition¹⁰.

⁸ In "L'Évolution psychologique et littéraire d'Érasme". In a more recent article, he appears to change his mind about the date of the *Brevissima formula*: "Histoire d'un opuscule d'Érasme: La *Brevissima maximeque compendiaria conficiendarum epistolarum formula*", in *Acta conventus neo-Latini Sanctandreami*, ed. I. D. McFarlane (Binghamton, N.Y., 1986), pp. 229-43. Cf. n. 14 below.

⁹ Fol. 3, B3^r, ff. The British Library copy has been microfilmed in the series *Early English Books 1475-1640* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms International), STC 10496, Reel 1752.

¹⁰ See Jolidon, "L'Évolution psychologique et littéraire d'Érasme", and Charles Fantazzi's introductory note to his English translation of *De conscribendis epistolis* in CWE

A second stage in the composition of the *Opus de conscribendis epistolis* is revealed by Despauterius' citations in the *Syntaxis*, a work completed by 11 November 1508, though published the following year, as the colophon declares: *Explicita est secunda pars grammaticae Despauterianae anno .M.D.VIII. tertio Idus Novembres ab ipso Despauterio exarata. Et anno proxime subsecuto ab Ascensio in Parrhisiorum Lutecia impressa.* Despauterius must have had before him a draft of the whole argument of the *Opus de conscribendis epistolis* essentially as we know it. He does not quote Erasmus' extensive classification, discussion, and illustration of the types of letters, but he apparently saw it, since he concludes his citations from Erasmus by referring the reader to the original for discussion *de exordiis, narrationibus, generibus causarum — deliberativo, demonstrativo, et judiciali — de exemplis caeterisque non dictis* (fol. 139, S5^v). He concentrates instead on quoting and summarizing Erasmus' comments on the nature and style of the letter, views that we know from the first quarter of the authorized edition, exactly the section that does not appear in the *Libellus* (ASD I-2 209-300). Despauterius begins with advice, gleaned from Erasmus and other humanists, on formulas of *salutatio* and *valedictio* and such related conventions as the use of the plural and of epithets (ASD I-2 266-300). He briefly mentions, too, Erasmus' remarks on beginning the letter abruptly, which in the authorized edition have been incorporated in the section on the *genus deliberativum* (ASD I-2 323-24). He then summarizes the views that Erasmus expresses in the opening chapters of *Opus de conscribendis epistolis* (ASD I-2 209-27). However, the brief chapter *De compositione* in this section (ASD I-2 222) is not quoted. Despauterius also does not quote directly from the three chapters on pedagogy in Erasmus' finished treatise (ASD I-2 227-66). However, he does describe the method Erasmus outlines there of using situations drawn from the students' reading of classical literature and history as the themes of their composition exercises in epistolary form: *Themata vel materias (ut vocant) docet dare venustissime Herasmus, nam sumere debemus ex poetis, historicis, caeterisque, non de nugis et calceis resarciendis, ut vulgo faciunt triviales, sed omnium pessime, quorum discipuli nunquam discunt epistolas componere, et plus tamen placent inepto popello istorum nugae quam quorundam doctorum seria* (fol. 139, S5^{r-v}).

XXV-XXVI 4-6 for detailed comparisons of the *Libellus de conscribendis epistolis* with the authorized edition.

Before the end of 1508, then, Erasmus had revised his treatise on letter-writing, which already classified, described, and illustrated in considerable detail the many types of letters. Specifically, he had replaced its brief opening remarks on style with 1) a long introduction on the nature of the genre, 2) a discussion of teaching letter-writing, and 3) a critical analysis of conventional formulas. Unfortunately, Despauterius' *Syntaxis* offers only a tantalizing hint about Erasmus' pedagogy at this period, but its extensive quotations on the other two topics reveal Erasmus' growing distaste for two extremes in the spectrum of contemporary letter-writing, medieval barbarism and Ciceronian purism.

Erasmus' opposition to medieval barbarism is already apparent in the *Libellus*. In 1500, medieval formulas could still be found in such popular treatises as the *Epistolarum formulae* (Louvain: Jan Veldener, 1476) of Carolus Virulus, former regent of the Lily at Louvain, although humanists such as Heinrich Bebel had begun to attack them¹¹. In the *Libellus*, Erasmus criticizes the long, obsequious *salutationes* of unlearned letter writers, who describe their correspondents by such epithets as *hunc solem, illum Luciferum, alium lucernam ardentem, speculum, candelabrum, thuribulum, thesaurum, sacrarium, apicem, culmen, florem, gemmam, jubar, paradisum* (fol. 1, Bl^v; cf. ASD I-2 282). The style of the letter should be familiar, not grandiloquent, like whispering in a corner with a friend rather than declaiming on the stage (fol. 1, Bl^r). By the end of 1508, Erasmus has expanded these remarks into a satire of medieval flattery. His amusing parody of the flattering *salutatio* appears in Despauterius' *Syntaxis* for the first time: *Perspicacissimo viro, candelabro aureo septem liberalium artium eradianti, theologorum apici, lucernae doctrina rutilanti, charitate flagranti, necnon mysteriorum divinorum sacrario, utriusque testamenti gazophilacio, atque omnium virtutum heroicarum et ethicarum speculo limpidissimo, domino meo domino praeceptori, dominationis vestrae discipulus et indignus servulus* (fol. 131, R5^{r-v}; cf. ASD I-2 282.16-83.4). So does his expression of disgust for those who minutely distinguish clerical rank by the order and choice of epithets, *ut pontificem summum, sanctissimum patrem tantum dicamus, episcopum, reverendum, abbatem, venerabilem* (fol. 135, Sl^{r-v}; cf. ASD I-2 293.20-94.1), so that *magistrum nostrum* means theologian, but *nostrum magistrum* can mean goatherd. In fact, Erasmus' criticism of the pretensions of theologians becomes so scathing here that

¹¹ See my discussion in "Erasmus on the Art of Letter-Writing", pp. 340-44.

in the authorized edition, published after the Lutheran storm had broken, he seems to have found it prudent to expunge certain sentences that Despauterius had remarked in the earlier manuscript: *Tune, o theologe taetrice, morum censor et gravitatis columen, his nugis tibi places? Tune, dogma professus, quod vetuit venerabile nomen affectare-mus, cristas canas erigis quoties magister noster appellaris? †Quam† diluturus si quis noster magicum illud pronomen praetulerit?* (fol. 135, Sl^v).

More surprising is the evidence that Erasmus' distaste for Italian Ciceronianism developed before 1509. I have argued in "Erasmus on the Art of Letter-Writing" that the first eight chapters of the *Opus de conscribendis epistolis* are directed against the Ciceronians, those erudite men who insist that all letters be written in the classical plain style: *Qui in epistolis vnum aliquem characterem vel requirunt, vel praescribunt, id quod ab eruditioribus etiam quibusdam video factum: ii mihi nimirum de re tam multiplici, propeque in infinitum varia nimis anguste atque arcte videntur agere* (ASD I-2 209.5-8). To Erasmus, both medieval formulas and Ciceronian purism forced the letter into a straight jacket. He considered it the most flexible of all genres. Unlike a book, which has to please the learned public, a letter is a private communication between individuals on any topic of interest to them. Therefore it may be written in any style that suits both the subject matter and the personalities and circumstances of the correspondents.

Despauterius quotes and summarizes this opening section at length. Moreover, he sees it as an argument against the Ciceronians. After he had completed the *Syntaxis*, the learned courtier Georgius Haloinus showed him a number of works that he had not previously read. Despauterius used this new material to write *Annotationes ad Syntaxim*, as he himself explains in the dedicatory letter dated 29 January 1510¹². The note to his quotations from Erasmus' chapter *Quis epistolae character* (the important opening chapter of the authorized edition) observes that Erasmus' views wholly agree with those expressed by

¹² Paris: Bade, n.d. The *Annotationes* are bound with the *Syntaxis* in the copy in Stiftsbibliothek Klosterneuburg. Assuming that this first edition was not extant, Marie-José Desmet-Goethals published Despauterius' prefatory letter to Johannes Leupa and Levinus Crucius from the second edition of the *Annotationes* (Paris: J. Bade, 15 Oct. 1511): *Levinus Crucius en zijn Threnodia (1548)* (Brussels 1985), pp. 44-45. The letter in this second edition is identical in substance to that in the first edition except that it is dated *Anno M. D. IX Quarto Calendas Februarias*, following the old style. It is interesting for the information it provides about the availability of texts in the Low Countries at this time.

Angelo Poliziano in the opening letter of his published epistles and in his correspondence with Paolo Cortesi¹³. Poliziano collected his letters shortly before his death at the request of his former pupil, Piero de' Medici. In the opening letter of the collection, he defended himself against anticipated criticism of his eclectic style by arguing that he had written his letters for particular occasions, not as a unified collection. Furthermore, he said wryly, no matter what stylistic characteristic might be singled out for criticism in his letters, he could justify it as an imitation of some classical letter-writer. Poliziano then named a score of classical models that he might cite as authorities. Poliziano's famous controversy with Cortesi over the exclusive imitation of Cicero began when Poliziano, returning a collection of letters that Cortesi had made, commented that he had wasted his time reading them because they merely aped Cicero. Poliziano argued that the writer should develop his own style once he had read widely and had thoroughly assimilated Cicero and other good writers. Cortesi answered with a defence of his position that Cicero should be imitated exclusively.

There can be no doubt that Erasmus was Poliziano's successor in the Ciceronian controversy. In the *Ciceronianus* (Basel: *in officina Frobeniana*, March 1528), Erasmus cited the Poliziano-Cortesi correspondence, arguing that Cortesi had failed to understand and answer Poliziano's argument (ASD I-2 706.14-7.20). In the authorized *Opus de conscribendis epistolis*, Erasmus singled Poliziano out from his contemporaries as a model of epistolary style, comparing him favorably with Cicero and

¹³ *Omnia opera Angeli Politiani* (Venice: *in aedibus Aldi Romani*, July 1498; rptd. in facsimile, Rome: Editrice Bibliopola Vivarelli e Gullà, n.d.), f. a3r-v, 12v-4v. These letters have been translated into English by the Rev. W. Parr Greswell, *Memoirs of Angelus Politianus*, 2nd ed. aug. (Manchester 1805), pp. 123-27, and Izora Scott, *Controversies over the Imitation of Cicero* (N.Y. 1910), Part I, pp. 17-22. At least one contemporary accepted Despauterius' interpretation of Erasmus' treatise. Johannes Nemius in his *Epitome ex opere D. Erasmi Roterod. de conscribendis epistolis* (Antwerp: J. Latius, 1556; orig. pub. 1552), A6^r, compares Erasmus' chapter *De habitu epistolae* (ASD I-2 222-24) with Poliziano's opening letter to Piero de' Medici. Nemius' "epitome" also draws upon several other works of Erasmus, including the pirated *Brevissima formula*, as well as upon the *Ars epistolica* of Despauterius and the *Epistolica* of Georgius Macropedius (Antwerp: J. Hillen, 1543). Nemius, A7^r, goes on to compare the chapter on *imitatio* in Erasmus' *Brevissima formula* (CWE XXV-XXVI 259-60) with Poliziano's letter to Cortesi. Since Nemius, B3v-4^r, borrows from Despauterius a distinction between three types of *salutatio* (*tacita*, *brevis*, *absoluta*), there seems little doubt that his comparisons of Erasmus and Poliziano were inspired by Despauterius' annotation, which was incorporated into the *Ars epistolica*. I am grateful to the Bibliotheek van de Rijksuniversiteit te Gent for supplying a photocopy of Nemius' work.

Pliny (ASD I-2 265.1-66.8), and he frequently cited Poliziano's correspondence in illustration of particular types of letters (ASD I-2 474.11, 513.9, 524.9-10, etc.). Erasmus praised Poliziano as early as August 1497 in a letter written from Paris for his pupil Heinrich Northoff (Ep. 61), and we know from later letters that Erasmus continued to admire the Italian humanist throughout his life¹⁴. Poliziano is mentioned twice in Despauterius' quotations from Erasmus, once in a sample *salutatio* (fol. 132, R6^v) and once as an example of a writer who sometimes began his letters abruptly (fol. 139, S5^r; cf. ASD I-2 226.9-12).

Despauterius' comparison of Erasmus and Poliziano would come as no surprise if it were not for the date of his *Syntaxis*. In 1508, Erasmus was in Italy, busy at the Aldine press with the much enlarged edition of his *Adagia* and with editions of the comedies of Plautus and Terence and tragedies of Seneca. On 6 April 1509 he would hear a Good Friday sermon addressed to the Pope at Rome that he would later satirize in the *Ciceronianus* (ASD I-2 637-9). In 1516 he would defend St. Jerome against Theodore Gaza's charge that he was not truly Ciceronian, arguing, as Eugene F. Rice, Jr., observes, that true eloquence is "to write splendidly about important matters with the usage and diction of one's own time"¹⁵. In 1517 he would describe Giovanni Pontano as similar to the unbearable apes of Cicero (Ep. 531). In 1518 he might read

¹⁴ See article on Poliziano in *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, ed. Peter G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher, 3 vols. (Toronto 1985-87), III 106-8. In 1497 Erasmus must have known Poliziano's *Miscellanea*, which had been published in 1489, rather than his letters, which were first published in the *Omnia opera* of 1498. Erasmus does not mention Poliziano in the *Libellus*. In a list of sample invectives there, he names the exchanges of Demosthenes and Aeschines, Cicero and Sallust (now considered spurious), Jerome and Rufinus, Poggio and Valla (fol. 67, S3^v). In the authorized edition, the correspondence between Poliziano and Scala has been added to this list (ASD I-2 536-37). In the *Brevissima formula* Erasmus names Poliziano as a model of epistolary style, *propter incredibilem rerum nitorem exactamque diligentiam, qua in quibusdam epistolis est usus* (Antwerp: Michaël Hillen, 23 July 1521, [A3^r]). Jolidon has observed that Poliziano's style is likewise characterized by *nitore incredibili* in Erasmus' preface to the first edition of the *Adagiorum collectanea* (Paris: Johannes Philippi, [June 1500]), dedicated to Mountjoy (Ep. 126). For this and other reasons, Jolidon suggests in "L'Évolution psychologique et littéraire d'Érasme" that the *Brevissima formula* was written in 1500, soon after the *Libellus*. He seems to change his mind in "Histoire d'un opuscule d'Érasme", where he describes the *Brevissima formula* as a mutilated version of Erasmus' first draft for Robert Fisher. The enigma of the *Brevissima formula* deserves further consideration. I intend to propose an alternative explanation of the origin of this work to the Seventh International Congress of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies in Toronto, 8-13 August 1988.

¹⁵ *Divi Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis Opera omnia*, ed. Erasmus et al., 9 vols. (Basel: J. Froben, 1516), I, a5^r; Rice, *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance* (Baltimore 1985), p. 134.

the letters exchanged between Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola and Pietro Bembo on the imitation of Cicero, when they would be published at Basel by Froben, and in 1519 he would meet the Ciceronian Christophe de Longueil (Ep. 1706), whom contemporaries would later identify with the obsessive Nosoponus of the *Ciceronianus*. On 23 August 1525, Thomas Lupset would send him from Padua a copy of Longueil's works published in 1524 (Ep. 1595), and the following year Erasmus would begin to mention the Ciceronian disease in his correspondence. The only evidence I have found that Erasmus was aware of apish Ciceronianism in 1508 is that provided by Despauterius' *Syntaxis* and its accompanying *Annotationes*, yet it seems clear from the internal evidence that Despauterius was right in interpreting Erasmus' chapter *Quis epistolae character* as directed against the Ciceronians. Unless Erasmus sent a manuscript of his revised *De conscribendis epistolis* from Italy to friends in the North, he must have begun forming his opposition to Italian Ciceronianism even before his Italian sojourn, in part no doubt from reading Poliziano.

Thus dating Erasmus' revisions of the *De conscribendis epistolis* becomes important for understanding the development of his opposition to extreme Ciceronianism. The difficulty is that, as Wallace K. Ferguson laments, Erasmus' correspondence is "the sole source for much of his life", yet "only about fifteen per cent of his surviving letters were written before the summer of 1514, at which time he was at least forty-five and possibly two or three years older"¹⁶. We know comparatively little of the important years when, although Erasmus had not yet achieved the European-wide fame that was to come in 1514, he enjoyed the stimulation of humanist circles in the Low Countries, in Paris, and in England and for three years tasted the intellectual delights of Italy. On Erasmus' place in humanist circles at Louvain and Paris, however, Despauterius' *Syntaxis* offers some unexplored evidence.

That Despauterius knew Erasmus personally is clear from a revealing allusion to Erasmus' physical appearance. Despauterius applied to Erasmus a description of Tydeus in Statius' *Thebais*, I, 417: *Desiderius Herasmus Roterodamus, amoenissimo ingenio et poeta et orator, de quo verissime dici potest, Major in exiguo regnabat corpore virtus* ... (fol. 138, S4^v). That Despauterius admired Erasmus is shown by the superlatives he uses in quoting him here and elsewhere in the section of the *Syntaxis*

¹⁶ Introduction to *The Correspondence of Erasmus*, in CWE I ix-x.

on letter-writing: *peritissimus poeta et orator* (fol. 131, R5^r), *doctissimus Herasmus* (fol. 132, R6^v; fol. 136, S2^v), *eloquentissimus orator et poeta* (fol. 135, S1^v), *doctissimus orator et poeta Herasmus* (fol. 136, S2^r), *suavissimum Herasmmum* (fol. 138, S4^r). Of the several authors from whom Despauterius borrowed for his discussion of letter-writing, none other, not even his publisher, *vir doctissimus Badius* (fol. 132, R6^v), is cited so frequently in such complimentary terms, for as Despauterius explains, *Herasmus ... videtur mihi de arte epistolari inter caeteros doctissime scriptitasse; ideo libentius sum eius quam aliorum aut mea denique praecepta complexus* (fol. 138, S4^v). On the other side, the restrained tone and anonymity of Erasmus' complaint about Despauterius' borrowings suggest that he was not anxious to alienate a respected colleague.

The two humanists must have met at the University of Louvain during Erasmus' first sojourn there, 1502-1504. Despauterius (De Spouter) was probably younger than Erasmus. He was born at Ninove, perhaps about 1480, since he matriculated at Louvain as a poor student of the Lily on 31 August 1498¹⁷. He was promoted M. A. in 1501 and, when Erasmus arrived in the late summer of 1502, had begun his teaching career. From the Lily he apparently moved, in order "to tutor more young men than his lectures, scantily paid by the Pedagogy, allowed", to "lodgings in the thinly populated Beghard College, the Louvain Convent of the Third Rule of St. Francis, in Castle Street", or so Henry de Vocht has deduced from the fact that his first work, *Orthographiae isagoge*, was dated from there 21 September 1506 (HCT I 206-7). He must also have begun his *Ars versificatoria* at Louvain, since the dedication to Georgius Haloinus, dated 1510, records that Despaute-

¹⁷ On Despauterius' life, works, and influence, see J. J. Baebler, *Beiträge zu einer Geschichte der Lateinischen Grammatik im Mittelalter* (Halle 1885), pp. 140-69; Alphonse Roersch, *Biographie nationale*, XXIII (1921-24), 303-12; Henry de Vocht, ed., *Litterae virorum eruditorum ad Franciscum Craneveldium 1522-1528* (Louvain 1928), Epp. 288-89; HCT I 201-14; *Bibliotheca Belgica*, rééd. M.-T. Lenger, II (1964), 103-84; J. Theys, *Nationaal Biografisch Woordenboek* II (1966), 169-70; M. Lavency, "A propos de la grammaire de Despautère", *Humanités chrétiennes* XXII (1968-69), 401-8; L. Reyens, S. J., "Despauterius, Luther en Erasmus", *Ons Geestelijk Erf* XLIII (1969), 430-34; M. A. Nauwelaerts, *Latijnse School en Onderwijs te 's-Hertogenbosch tot 1629*, *Bijdragen tot de Geschiedenis van het Zuiden van Nederland*, 30 (Tilburg 1974), pp. 132-35, 209-13, *et passim*; Louis Desgraves, "Contribution à la bibliographie des éditions de Joannes Despauterius (†Comines 1520) aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles", *Mémoires de la Société d'histoire de Comines-Warneton et de la région VII* (1977), 385-402; C. Matheeußen, "Á propos d'une lettre inconnue de Despautère", *Lias* IV (1977), 3-11; Desmet-Goethals, *Levinus Crucius*, pp. 27, 44-45, 49, 59-62, 69-77, 173-78, *et passim*.

rius had spent six years writing the treatise. From Louvain he went on to direct the Latin schools at Komen (Comines) and (by 1 October 1509, when he dedicated the *Syntaxis*) at Sint-Winoksbergen (now Bergues). In 1514 he returned to Komen and died there in 1520. Despauterius became one of the most famous grammarians of the Renaissance. In addition to the *Orthographiae isagoge*, *Syntaxis*, *Ars versificatoria*, and *Ars epistolica* already mentioned, he published *Grammaticae prima pars* (1512), *Rudimenta* (1511 or 1514), *De figuris liber ex Quintiliano, Donato, Diomede, Valla ... diligenter concinnatus* (1519), and annotations to Torrentinus' commentary on the *Doctrinale* of Alexander de Villa Dei (1518 or 1520). His grammars were annotated, epitomized, and translated up to the eighteenth century.

Perhaps Despauterius obtained the manuscript of the revised *De conscribendis epistolis* directly from Erasmus, or perhaps a common friend at Louvain or in the humanist milieu of Bade's printshop at Paris was an intermediary. Erasmus left Louvain in the winter of 1504 for Paris, where he entrusted to Bade the publication of Lorenzo Valla's annotations on the New Testament, edited from a manuscript that Erasmus had discovered in the old library of the Premonstratensian monastery of Park near Louvain¹⁸. From the autumn of 1505 to the early summer of 1506, Erasmus was in England. Having at last arranged a journey to Italy as master to the sons of Henry VII's court physician, Giovanni Battista Boerio of Genoa, he returned to the Continent and spent the months of June and July in Paris. Before continuing his travels, he entrusted to Bade his translations of Euripides and Lucian, a collection of *Epigrammata*, and his previously published *Adagia*, all of which Bade subsequently printed. Bade became Despauterius' regular publisher at least as early as the *Syntaxis* of 1509¹⁹. As I have indicated, the section

¹⁸ *In Latinam Novi Testamenti interpretationem ex collatione Graecorum exemplarium adnotationes apprime utiles* (Paris: J. Bade for himself and Jean Petit, 13 April 1505).

¹⁹ Although the *Orthographiae isagoge* was written in 1506, the *Syntaxis* may have been Despauterius' first published work. Henry de Vocht (HCT I 207 n. 4) thought the first edition of the *Orthographiae isagoge* was that appended to the *Ars epistolica* (Paris: J. Bade, 1 July 1515). More recently, an edition published by Bade 13 June 1510 has been recorded: *Inventaire chronologique des éditions parisiennes du XVI^e siècle*, I (1972), no. 82. Perhaps this was the first edition of the *Orthographiae isagoge*, since that appended to the *Annotationes in Syntaxim* (Paris: J. Bade, 15 October 1511) ends with a note that it has been published *russum: Vale mi Barptolomaeae* [Barthélemy Nicolas, *bibliographicus* at Ypres] *nosque (ut facis) ama: E cubiculo nostro undecimo Calendas octobres anno a natali Christiano millesimo quingentesimo sexto ex aedibus fratrum tertij ordinis seraphici Francisci. Impressa autem sunt russum Parrhisij in aedibus Ascensianis ad Idus Octob. M.D.XI.*

on letter-writing in the *Syntaxis* was compiled from the treatises of several contemporary authorities. These include Niccolò Perotti's *Rudimenta grammatices*, Antonio Mancinelli's *Modus scribendi orandique*, Agostino Dati's *Elegantiolae*, Giovanni Sulpizio's *De componendis orandisque epistolis*, and Bade's own *In epistolarum compositionem compendium isagogicum*, all printed by Bade before the end of 1508²⁰. Despauterius, with the encouragement of his publisher, may well have intended his discussion of letter-writing as a compendium of the best humanist authorities available in Bade's printshop. If Bade or someone else in his milieu, such as Fausto Andrelini, had a manuscript of Erasmus' *De conscribendis epistolis*, the temptation to publish it in some form, even if the author had warned that it was not yet ready for the press, must have been overwhelming²¹.

Other evidence in the *Syntaxis* suggests that Erasmus completed before he went to Italy the revisions of *De conscribendis epistolis* that Despauterius saw. In the passages Despauterius quotes from Erasmus, I have found no references to the friends and acquaintances that Erasmus met in Italy. Erasmus does mention the Italians Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola, Enea Silvio Piccolomini (Pope Pius II), and Marsilio Ficino, as well as Angelo Poliziano, but all these authors had an international reputation, all but Pico were dead before Erasmus arrived in Italy, and there is no evidence that he met the Count of Mirandola there²². On the other hand, Erasmus reveals a first-hand knowledge of the political and intellectual milieux of the Low Countries and France. The names of several fifteenth-century rulers appear in Erasmus' sample salutations:

See *Imprimeurs et libraires parisiens du XVI^e siècle*, II (1969), Addenda (Josse Bade), pp. 388-89, no. 159 bis.

²⁰ See *Imprimeurs et libraires parisiens du XVI^e siècle*, II (1969), 26, 37, 39, 52, 91. Bade had written commentaries on the treatises of Perotti and Mancinelli, and, together with Josse Clichthove, on that of Dati. He published the treatise of Dati with its two commentaries in a collection of grammatical works that included Sulpizio's treatise on letter-writing and his own. Despauterius must have been using this edition, since he mentions Dati and Clichthove together in discussing the dating of letters in the *Syntaxis* (fol. 137, S3^r). The same collection of grammatical and epistolary treatises contains the *Triginta regulae* of Francesco Negro, whom Despauterius also cites in the *Syntaxis* (fol. 137, S3^v).

²¹ Andrelini is mentioned in Despauterius' citations from Erasmus in the *Syntaxis* (fol. 132, R6^r; fol. 133, R7^r). Erasmus met the Italian humanist in Paris in 1495 through Robert Gaguin. See *Contemporaries of Erasmus* I 53-56. Despauterius himself mentions Andrelini's *Epistolae proverbiales et morales* (Paris: J. Bade, 15 May 1508) at fol. 139, S5^r.

²² See *Contemporaries of Erasmus* III 81.

King Louis XI of France; Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy; and William VI, Count of Holland. Among contemporaries that Erasmus names are Pierre Barbier, who was chaplain to Philip the Handsome, Duke of Burgundy, in 1501, and such friends as Jacob Batt (d. 1502), Fausto Andrelini, and Jacob de Voecht or Jacobus Tutor, all of whom Erasmus had met before 1501, apparently at Bergen-op-Zoom, Paris, and Orléans respectively. The text does not make clear whether Erasmus or Despauterius is responsible for the salutation from Joannes Naeuius (Jan de Neve) of the University of Louvain to an unidentifiable Paulus Montanus *philosophus*, or which one of them selected the cities Rome, Paris, Ghent, and Ypres to illustrate how the place from which a letter is written should be indicated.

The reference to Jacobus Tutor as *Handwerpiae agens* perhaps suggests a *terminus post quem* for the completion of Erasmus' manuscript. According to Henry de Vocht, Tutor was appointed pensionary of Antwerp by the end of 1505 and took his oath of office on 10 February 1506 (HCT II 110 n. 2). Other evidence of the date of the manuscript is provided by Despauterius' usual reference to the author as Desyderius Herasmus Roteradamus, Roterodamus, or Rotterdamus. As P. S. Allen observes (Ep. 1 n.), "Erasmus in his youth spelt his name Herasmus The earliest authentic use of Erasmus is in 1503 (Epp. 173, 174); and Roterodamus [rather than Rotterdammensis] first appears in 1504 (Epp. 179, 180). Herasmus Rotterdamus still survives in the reprint of the first edition of the *Adagia*, Paris, Io. Philippi, 1505; but after that Erasmus discards it. Cf. Epp. 182, 187, 188. The full form Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus occurs first in the second edition of the *Adagia*, Paris, J. Badius, 24 Dec. 1506". Despauterius regularly refers to Erasmus as *poeta et orator*. The 1515 edition of the *Syntaxis* usually changes this epithet to *theologus et orator*, for by that time Erasmus had obtained the doctorate in theology from the University of Turin (4 September 1506). By 11 November 1508, Despauterius does not seem to have been aware either of Erasmus' doctorate from Turin or of his preference for the unaspirated form of his name, and these facts perhaps suggest that Despauterius was not in correspondence with Erasmus in Italy and that he was working with a manuscript written sometime in 1505 or 1506. In 1526, Erasmus commented that he had in his library a manuscript of his treatise on letter-writing copied twenty years earlier by an *amanuensis* (Allen, IV xx), but his dating of his early drafts is unreliable²³. Although

²³ See Jolidon, "Histoire d'un opusculé d'Érasme", p. 230.

the evidence is inconclusive, the most reasonable interpretation may be that Erasmus completed a revised version of the *De conscribendis epistolis* during his stay in Paris in June and July 1506.

Whatever the case, through Despauterius, Erasmus' views on letter-writing must have been widely known more than a decade before Froben published the authorized *Opus de conscribendis epistolis* in 1522. The *Syntaxis* was immediately popular. As I have noted, Bade published a second edition in 1511 and 1513. Matthias Schürer reprinted the treatise at Strasbourg in 1515. The third edition, published by Claude Chevallon at Paris ca. 1516-17, was thoroughly revised and augmented. The section on letter-writing was omitted there and in future editions of the *Syntaxis*, since it had been revised for separate publication as the *Ars epistolica*. In revising, Despauterius wrote with a new authority, adding new material, abbreviating his quotations from Erasmus and others, integrating his authorities more carefully into his own argument, and incorporating his annotations in the text, but he still cited Erasmus' most distinctive and important opinions about letter-writing. Thus the central arguments of Erasmus' *De conscribendis epistolis* continued to circulate in Despauterius' popular *Ars epistolica*²⁴.

Scholars have not been aware that Erasmus' views also found their way into a discussion *De certa epistolandi forma* at the end of a syntax entitled *Sequunda pars artis grammaticae* (Paris: Nicolas des Prez for Denis Roce, 24 October 1515) by another Flemish grammarian, Petrus Pontanus. Pontanus clearly did not have access to Erasmus' *De conscribendis epistolis* in manuscript. He borrows from Despauterius' *Ars epistolica* without naming either Despauterius or Erasmus as his sources. Erasmus could not have been complaining of Pontanus in the preface to *Absolutissimus de octo orationis partium constructione libellus*, since that work appeared in print a month before Pontanus' syntax. Nevertheless, Pontanus' *Sequunda pars artis grammaticae* increased the circulation of

²⁴ *Bibliotheca Belgica*, rééd. M.-T. Lenger, II (1964), 148-56, catalogues twenty-one editions or reprints between 1513 and 1582. W. Nijhoff and M.E. Kronenberg, *Nederlandsche Bibliographie van 1500 tot 1540* (The Hague 1923-66), II, nos. 2759-60, add two published at Antwerp by Michaël Hillen in 1529 and 1537. Louis Desgraves, "Contribution à la bibliographie des éditions de Joannes Despauterius", no. 11, gives notice of another published at Poitiers by Enguilbert de Marnef ca. 1528. *Imprimeurs et libraires parisiens* II, nos. 521, 578, has cited editions of this work joined to others by Bade, 1 Apr. 1523 and 25 Dec. 1527. I have seen also an *Ars epistolica* in the Bodleian Library, D. 7.15. Linc., published in *aedibus M. Nicolai de Barra*, 31 December 1520, and another without publisher or date in St. John's College Library, Oxford, c. 3.16 (10).

Erasmus' views on letter-writing, appearing in at least six editions between 1520 and 1529²⁵. The relations between Despauterius and Pontanus are curious. They seem to have been rivals for the Paris textbook market throughout their careers. Perhaps this was the cause of a long-standing, lively quarrel between them in their published grammars. It seems a strange coincidence that both suffered loss of eyesight. Despauterius' epitaph records that he had lost an eye; Pontanus called himself *Caecus Brugensis*, having been blinded in an accident at age three.

Pontanus (De Ponte or Van der Brugge) was born at Bruges about 1475²⁶. He spent some years in the abbey of St. Bertin at Saint-Omer and in the abbey of St. Vaast at Arras before establishing himself at Paris as a teacher about the beginning of the sixteenth century. He married and became a prolific father and even more prolific poet and grammarian, publishing more than thirty *opuscula*. He was encouraged for a time by Bade, who published his *De habitu et reditu pacis carmen* (n.d. but ca. 1508, from the printer's mark and an allusion to the League of Cambrai) and his *De vita et obitu ... Philippi regis Castellae atque Hispaniae* (n.d. but with dedication dated 4 October 1512)²⁷. However, most of his works were published by other Parisian printers. After all, Bade could offer his public a selection of grammatical texts by the successful Despauterius.

The quarrel between the two Flemish grammarians began in 1511, when in the *Ars versificatoria* Despauterius accused Pontanus of making a mistake in the quantity of a vowel. He seems to have been referring to a poem by Pontanus published *ante quoddam opusculum Baptistae Mantuani* in which Pontanus assumed that the penultimate vowel in *choragus* is long. Despauterius criticized the following dactylic hexameter line: *Divorum posita fit majestate choragus*²⁸. Despauterius at

²⁵ See *Bibliotheca Belgica*, rééd. M.-T. Lenger, IV (1964), pp. 716-18.

²⁶ On Pontanus' life and works, see Alphonse Roersch in *Biographie nationale*, XVIII (1904), 13-16, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, rééd. M.-T. Lenger, IV (1964), pp. 703-26, and Desmet-Goethals, *Levinus Crucius*, pp. 174-76. I have not been able to consult two studies noted by Desmet-Goethals, p. 174 n. 306: A. Dewitte, "Petrus de Ponte, Brugs leraar te Parijs 1500-1539", in *Haec olim: Jaarboek Oudleerlingenbond St. Lodewijkcollege*, 17 (Bruges 1967), 48-57, and P. Blondelle, "De eclogen van Petrus Pontanus", *ibid.*, 23 (1973), 76-85.

²⁷ *Inventaire chronologique des éditions parisiennes du XVI^e siècle*, I, no. 168; II, no. 438.

²⁸ I have been unable to identify the work of Battista Spagnuoli of Mantua before which Pontanus' verse appeared. Edmondo Coccia, O. Carm., *Le edizioni delle opere del Mantovano* (Rome: Institutum Carmelitanum, 1960), no. 146, describes an edition of Pontanus' *De habitu et reditu pacis carmen* in a collection of verse that includes *De fortuna*

first thought on the authority of Martial that the penultimate vowel in *choragus* is short²⁹. The following year, Despauterius changed his mind and, as Pontanus admitted, sung an *honestam palinodiam* in *Liber sextus de verbis defectivis et anomalis* of his *Grammaticae prima pars* (Paris: J. Bade, 23 October 1512). Despauterius had found some verses in Suetonius' life of Augustus in which the penultimate vowel of *choragus* was long³⁰. However, the retraction did not prevent Pontanus' launching into an invective against an unnamed compatriot on the pretense of defending the Christian poet Mantuan against those who preferred the verses of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Martial³¹. Some years later, Pontanus renewed his attack when Despauterius, in his annotations to Torrentinus' commentary on the *Doctrinale* of Alexander de Villa Dei (Deventer: Alb. Pafraet, 1520), corrected him again³². In *Liber figurarum* (Paris: Nicolas des Prez for Bernard Aubry, 1521), Pontanus addressed a letter entitled *Recriminatio in adversarium* to *Joanni Despauterio Ninivitae orthodoxorum mastigi catholico*³³. Pontanus once more accused Despauterius of preferring sordid classical poets to good Christian writers, including Bade and Erasmus, and of considering himself to be the only contemporary author worthy of praise. In attacking him, Despauterius showed no gratitude for help that Pontanus

Francisci Marchionis Mantuae, F. Baptistae Mantuani carmen elegantissimum (Strasbourg: Schürer, 1510). Unfortunately, I have not had an opportunity to see this work.

²⁹ *Ars versificatoria Joannis Despauterii* (Strasbourg: Matthias Schürer, December 1512), V6^v.

³⁰ In *Opera Joannis Despauterii Ninivitae* (Paris: François Regnault, 1533), k7^v.

³¹ In *Grammaticae artis prima pars* (Paris: Denis Rocce, ca. 1514), a3^r-4^v. Though Pontanus did not name Despauterius, he did identify his adversary for his readers by naming two of Despauterius' works.

³² The dedicatory letter is dated 10 February 1518: Nijhoff-Kronenberg II, no. 2289. Cf. I, 36; II, 2290, 2292. The only reported copy of this edition, at Osnabrück, has been lost, according to M.-J. Desmet-Goethals, who has found references to Pontanus in a reprint (Deventer: Alb. Pafraet, Aug. 1521) preserved at Strängnäs, pp. 9^v, 14^v, 17^v, 49^r, 50^r. Desmet-Goethals describes that on p. 49^r as "ronduit brutal: *id zoius noster ignoravit, qui hanc annotatiunculam suffuratus nobis pro sua non erubuit publicare*" and notes that the printer M. Hillenius omitted the sharpest attacks from his edition (Antwerp 1524): *Levinus Crucius*, p. 175 n. 309. Before this note came to my attention, Mr. Anthony R. A. Croiset van Uchelen, Curator of Rare Books in the Universiteits-Bibliotheek, Amsterdam, sent me a photocopy of the only reference to Pontanus that his staff could find in the edition of Hillenius, p. 14. It concerns vowel quantity (in the oblique cases of the noun *dioryx*). For further discussion of the quarrel between Despauterius and Pontanus, to which Crucius alludes in his *Threnodia* (1548), see Desmet-Goethals, pp. 174-76.

³³ *Petri Pontani Caeci Brugensis Liber figurarum, tam oratoribus quam poetis vel grammaticis necessarium duo succincte complectens capita, cum recriminatione in adversarium* (Paris: apud Ambrosium Girault, 1529), A1^v-3^r.

had given him in the past and no respect for age. These recriminations are curious. First, as we have seen, Despauterius had openly expressed his admiration for both Bade and Erasmus. Second, if the *Bibliotheca Belgica* is correct in assuming that Pontanus was born about 1475 and Despauterius about 1480, Pontanus was only five years older than his rival, though there is no firm evidence about their respective birthdates. At any rate, the quarrel ended there. By 1521 Pontanus' adversary was dead. Pontanus lived until after 1539. In his long controversy with Despauterius, he seems never to have acknowledged his wholesale borrowing from either of his compatriots, Despauterius or Erasmus.

In editing the relevant passages from Despauterius' 1509 *Syntaxis* and its *Annotationes*, I have expanded abbreviations and modernized punctuation and spelling, including i, j, s, u, and v. In proper names of contemporaries, however, and where alternative spellings are recognized by Lewis and Short³⁴, I have retained original spelling. Obvious errors have been silently emended, often with the 1515 edition of the *Syntaxis*, 1513 *Ars epistolica*, or Erasmus' *Opus de Conscribendis Epistolis* (ASD I-2) as guides. Where the emendations are more problematic, I have noted variants in these later versions of Erasmus' treatise.

Dept. of English
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Canada

³⁴ *A Latin Dictionary Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary*, revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short (Oxford 1879).

Texts

Citations of a manuscript draft of Erasmus' *De conscribendis epistolis* in *Syntaxis Johannis Despauterii* (Paris: Jodocus Badius Ascensius, 1509), R4^v-S5^v:

[fol. 130, R4^v] SALUTATIONIS ORDO ET QUALITAS

[fol. 131, R5^r] ... In salutatione nihil assentationis inveniatur, siquidem id est turpissimum, ut docet peritissimus poeta et orator Desyderius Herasmus Roteradamus dans ridiculae salutationis hoc exemplum omnem Gnatonis, Colacis, aut Gelasini assentationem longe superans: *Perspicacissimo viro, candelabro aureo septem liberalium [fol. 131, R5^v] artium eradianti, theologorum apici, lucernae doctrina rutilanti, charitate flagranti, necnon mysteriorum divinorum sacrario, utriusque testamenti gazophilacio*¹, *atque omnium virtutum heroicarum et ethicarum speculo limpidissimo, domino meo domino praeceptori, dominationis vestrae discipulus et indignus servulus*. Haec nova salutandi forma, viris Atticis incognita, tum demum nata est ubi theologi, ejectis oratoribus et grammaticis, ipsi ludos litterarios administrare coeperunt. Et ut idem praecipit Herasmus, non scribas cum indoctis *salutis* loco *Midae divitias*, aut quid similis deliramenti². ... Neque (ut ait Herasmus) si quando divus Hieronymus aut Augustinus vulgo concessit, id nunc oportet in ludum litterarium vocare, hac praesertim tempestate qua nihil est omnino litteris cum vulgo commune³. Idem Herasmus docet si patris nomen tuo velis asciscere, praepones patris nomen non in genitivo sed in eodem casu cum tuo, ut sit pater tuus Dionysius, nomen tuum Antonius, poteris dicere *Dionysius Antonius*⁴. Idem docet, ut ego quoque docui, non dicendum esse *Picus de Mirandula* sed *Picus Mirandulanus*, et caetera⁵. Idem docet

¹ *Ars epistolica* 1513: gazophylacio; *Syntaxis* 1515: gaxophilatio; ASD: gezophylacio, but Erasmus criticizes the epithet *omnis scibilis gazophylacium* at I-2 282.9. Cf. the editor's note on the use of this word in the letters of Jerome and the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum*.

² Compare ASD I-2 281.17-84.10, especially Erasmus' comic parody of the flattering salutation at 282.16. Gnatho, Colax, and Gelasinus are parasites of Roman comedy.

³ Compare ASD I-2 284.18-21. *Syntaxis* 1509: ac; *Syntaxis* 1515 and ASD: hac.

⁴ Compare ASD I-2 280.2-4.

⁵ Compare ASD I-2 281.6-9. On several members of the family Pico della Mirandola, see *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, ed. Peter G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher (Toronto 1985-87), III 80-84.

barbara cognomina quo pacto Latinam formam accipiant, ut Barbier, *Barbirius* aut melius *Tonsor*⁶, Ian de Langhe, *Langius* aut *Longus*, quod magis placet, et caetera⁷. Porro, inquit, in fingendis huiusmodi denominativis eam moderationem servari convenit, ut simul et auribus, quoad fieri potuerit, molliendo verbo consulamus et neque longius tamen a recepta et vernacula voce recedamus; quae, si quando erit absurdior quam quae in Latinam fictam possit retorqueri, pro barbara relicta erit reponenda, ne Romani sermonis puritatem ulla peregrinitas polluat. Haec Herasmus⁸.

DE NOMINIS EIUS QUI SCRIBIT SITU
[fol. 132, R6'] SCRIBENTIS NOMEN IN SALUTATIONE
VETERUM MORE ESSE PRAEPONENDUM

Mancinellus⁹, Perottus¹⁰, Herasmus, et plures praecipiant nomen

⁶ Erasmus probably refers to Pierre Barbier (Petrus Barbirius), who was chaplain to the future Maximilian I in 1486, to Philip the Handsome, Duke of Burgundy, in 1501, and to the future Charles V between 1515 and 1517. However, a younger Pierre Barbier (d. 7 December 1551/13 January 1552), perhaps a relative, matriculated at the University of Louvain on 3 August 1510, and his earliest extant letter to Erasmus is dated from Brussels on 18 July 1516 (Ep. 443). It is conceivable that Erasmus had met the younger Barbier before the end of 1508, perhaps at Paris, since Barbier may have entered Louvain as M. A. of another university. See *Contemporaries of Erasmus* I 93-94.

⁷ Compare ASD I-2 280.6-11. The authorized *De conscribendis epistolis* omits the Christian name of Ian de Langhe: "... pro *Lang*, *Langium*". His identity has puzzled editors. Jean-Claude Margolin in ASD has suggested Johann Lang of Lemberg in Silesia (1485-21 June 1565), Johann Lang of Erfurt (d. 2 April 1548), and Matthäus Lang of Augsburg (1468-30 March 1540). Charles Fantazzi has suggested Rudolf van Langen of Everswinkel (c. 1438-25 December 1519): *Collected Works of Erasmus*, XXV-XXVI (Toronto 1985), 52 n. 21. The vernacular form of the name in Despauterius and the 1508 composition date of his *Syntaxis* rule out all four. Perhaps Erasmus simply chose as an illustration a name rather common in the Low Countries.

⁸ Compare ASD I-2 281.2-6.

⁹ Antonio Mancinelli of Velletri (1452-1505), Italian poet and grammarian, wrote an elementary textbook of rhetoric, *Scribendi orandique modus* (Venice: S. Bevilacqua, 1493), which devotes several chapters to letter-writing. It was included in the edition of Mancinelli's *Opera* that Josse Bade printed, with his own commentary, for Jean Petit (Paris, 25 January-15 March 1505). See *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, II 372-3 and *Imprimeurs et libraires parisiens du XVI^e siècle*, II 37.

¹⁰ Niccolò Perotti of Fano (1429-14 December 1480) was a prominent grammarian, Greek translator, and secretary in the papal court, becoming Archbishop of Siponto in 1458. His *Rudimenta grammatices* (Rome: C. Sweynheym and A. Pannartz, 1473), which concludes with a section on letter-writing, was frequently reprinted throughout Europe. Bade published the edition of the work by Paul Hemmerlin of Andlau (Paulus Malleolus Andelocensis, documented 1486-1504), adding his own commentary, on 15 March 1504 and 15 July 1505. Erasmus praised Perotti's treatise in Ep. 117 and *De ratione studii* (ASD I-2 114-15, 148). See *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, II 175, III 68, and *Imprimeurs et libraires parisiens du XVI^e siècle*, II 26, 39.

scribentis esse praeponendum, etiam si ad maximum scribat minimus. Id verum esse patet liquide ex epistolis omnium veterum, Ciceronis, Plinii, caeterorumque, ut: *Cicero Terentiae uxori S. Terentia Ciceroni S.* Plautus in *Bacchidibus*: *Mnesilochus salutem dicit suo patri*. Si honor sit praeponi, nonne dixisset, *Patri suo salutem dicit Mnesilochus*? Quem decet (oro) magis quam patrem honore prosequi? Gnatonica profecto (inquit Herasmus) est illa nominum inversio, *Parmenonem suum summum plurima salute impertit Gnato*. Multa de his Herasmus praecipit¹¹. ... Nostri autem Pharissaei, qui contra domini praeceptum volunt vocari *rabbi* et primum quaerunt locum, quorum deus venter est et finis eorum interitus, eo superbiae devenerunt ut nisi, proprio omisso nomine, magistri dominique et reverendissimi quidem nominentur, putant nihil fieri atque adeo contemni. Hi sunt praecipue qui deberent nobis esse humilitatis sive modestiae exempla¹². Efferuntur beluae ab ineptis nebulonibus ultra deum, cui dicimus, *dimitte, da inducias*, omnia singulariter scilicet. Sed si honor est, cur non respondet clerus (inquit Herasmus) episcopo, *et cum spiritu vestro*? *Rogo te*, dicimus deo: *Te rogamus, audi nos*. At vermibus superbissimis dicere debemus, *Rogo majestatem vestram, paternitatem, dignitatem*, et caetera. Non sunt procul dubio Christi discipuli dicentis, *Discite a me, quia mitis et humilis sum corde*. Et haec in nebulones¹³. Facessat igitur foedissimus scribendi abusus: *Egregio viro ingenuarum artium magistro Magistro Iohanni*, et caetera. *Eximio viro domino decano Domino Ioanni*, et caetera. Ubi *magister, dominus*, et similia turpissime repetuntur, et barbariae nomen *dominus* praeponitur honoris causa, ut docet Perottus. Nomen ergo dignitatis aut magistratus postponemus proprio nomini. Cum eodem asserit hanc rem Herasmus in opere suo *De epistolis componendis*, veluti: *Sophronus Eusebius* [fol. 132, R6'] *Hieronymus Damaso papae S. D.*¹⁴ *Aristoteles Alexandro regi S. D. Alexander*

¹¹ Compare ASD I-2 278.9-14,

¹² Despauterius seems to be expressing his own view here, but he may have been influenced by Erasmus. See below.

¹³ Compare ASD I-2 266.9-76.14, especially 269.6-11. Matt. 11:29: *Tollite iugum meum super vos, et discite a me, quia mitis sum, et humilis corde: et invenietis requiem animabus vestris*. Professor Fantazzi informs me that *Te rogamus, audi nos* comes from a response in the Litany of the Saints. See *Missale Romanum*.

¹⁴ As Lietzmann in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, VIII-1 (1913) 1565 explains, St. Jerome "wird gelegentlich in den Überschriften seiner Werke als *Eusebius Sophronius Hieronymus* oder als *Eusebius Hieronymus* bezeichnet (Vallarsi XI 14. Migne XXII 12f.); da aber er selbst und seine Zeitgenossen nur den Namen *Hieronymus* gebrauchen, so wird die erweiterte Namensform als spätere Stilisierung anzusehen sein; *Eusebius* hieß der Vater ... *Sophronius* der Freund des Kirchenvaters, der mehrere seiner Werke ins Griechische übersetzt hat". The salutation remains unchan-

*magnus Aristoteli philosopho S. D. Herasmus Iacobo Tutori iuris pontificii consulto S. D.*¹⁵ Breviter (inquit Herasmus) nihil erit salutationi admiscendum quod ulla ex parte sapiat assentationem; nam magistratum et professionum cognomina adeo possunt citra adulationis notam aliis tribui, ut sibi etiam quisque citra arrogantiae culpam possit assumere, hunc in modum: *Ioannes Naevius theologus Paulo Montano philosopho salutem*¹⁶. Indicium hic habet sermo. Erras enim (ut idem docet), si te laudari putas cum *episcopus* scriberis aut *theologus*. Professionis ista sunt nomina, non gloriae. Is demum te laudaret qui *bonum episcopum* aut *eruditum theologum* scriberet. Id quod in salutatione non indocte fieri nequit. Haec et multo plura Erasmus¹⁷. ... Concludit Herasmus: Quod siquid a veterum consuetudine licebit aliquid innovare, tolerabitur novitas, modo vitium absit, id est, ne vel prolixitate molesta vel assentatione parasitica vel affectatione morosa sit salutatio, ne pessimum sit totius epistolae omen si statim a vitio fecerit auspicium. Haec ille¹⁸.

PURAE ET ANTIQUAE SALUTATIONIS FORMAE AB HERASMO COLLECTAE

Pius Aeneas pontifex Romanus Ludouico Gallorum regi S. P. D.¹⁹

ged in *Syntaxis* 1515, but in *Ars epistolica* 1513 and ASD, the names *Sophronus Eusebius* are omitted. Erasmus had recognized by 1516 that St. Jerome used only the single name *Hieronymus* in his letters, for in editing them he rejected as spurious the letter *Ad Oceanum de vita clericorum* because the author called himself *Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus*. See Rice, *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance*, pp. 127 and 248 n. 38. Pope Damasus (366-84) encouraged St. Jerome to revise the old Latin texts of the Gospels.

¹⁵ Iacobus Tutor or Jacob de Voecht of Antwerp (1477-1536) received a license in canon law in 1499 from Orléans. Erasmus, fleeing an outbreak of the plague at Paris, lodged with him at Orléans in the last quarter of 1500 and they became fast friends. See *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, III 416.

¹⁶ The salutation *Ioannes Naevius* etc. could be Despauterius' addition, although Erasmus probably met Jan de Neve of Hondschoote (d. 25 April 1522) during his first period of residence at Louvain, 1502-4. De Neve promoted M. A. at Louvain on 12 April 1494 and then proceeded to earn the Bachelor of Theology degree. Meanwhile he taught arts courses at the College of the Lily, eventually becoming its regent. Erasmus dedicated to De Neve his edition of *Catonis praecepta* on 1 August 1514 during a short visit to Louvain. See Ep. 298 and *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, III 15. I have not been able to identify Paulus Montanus.

¹⁷ Compare ASD I-2 281.10-20.

¹⁸ Compare ASD I-2 285.19-24.

¹⁹ Jean-Claude Margolin notes that the salutation in ASD I-2 286.3-4, *Pius pontifex Romanus, eius nominis primus, Lodovico Gallorum regi, eius nominis undecimo, S. D.*, must be invented, because Pope Pius I lived thirteen centuries before King Louis XI. The salutation quoted by Despauterius refers to contemporaries, Enea Silvio Piccolomini (18 October 1405-14/15 August 1464), who was elected Pope Pius II on 19 August 1458, and Louis XI,

Philippus Burgundiorum dux, Pio Aeneae summo pontifici S. P. D.²⁰
 M. Antonius Syriae Scerbono quaestori suo S. D.
 Aeschines orator civibus Atheniensibus S. D.
 Guilielmus Hollandiae praesens comes Cornelio suo S. D.²¹
 Demetrius eques Romanus Tito Livio iudici selecto S. D.²²
 Henricus Manlius Brabantiae thesaurarius Laurentio duci aulico
 S. D.²³
 Politianus Pico comiti Mirandulano S. D.²⁴
 Marsilius Platonius philosophus Fausto poetae S. D.²⁵
 Apelles pictor Lysippo statuario S. D.
 Cicero Tullius Marco Tullio Ciceroni patri S. D.
 Cicero Dolabellae genero S. D.²⁶

King of France (3 July 1423-30 August 1483), who was crowned on 15 August 1461. Such a salutation could thus have been written between 15 August 1461 and 14/15 August 1464. Erasmus admired Aeneas Sylvius as a letter-writer (Ep. 1206). See *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, III 97-98 and II 351. In *Syntaxis* 1515, this salutation is replaced by *Leo pontifex Romanus Henrico regi Angliae S. P. D.*

²⁰ Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy (31 July 1396-15 June 1467), reigned from 1419. See *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, I 228-29. Such a salutation could thus have been written between 19 August 1458 and 14/15 August 1464, when Enea Silvio Piccolomini was Pope Pius II. See previous note.

²¹ Willem VI, the last count of Holland of this name, ruled from 1404 to 1417. See *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, X 1214.

²² *Sic Syntaxis* 1509 and 1515; ASD I-2 286.6-7: *Demetrius eques Romanus Tito Lucio iudici selecto S. D.*

²³ I have been unable to identify either Henricus Manlius or Duke Lawrence. Manlius is not listed in any of the standard biographical dictionaries for the Low Countries. M. Andr  e Scufflaire of the Algemeen Rijksarchief, Brussels, who kindly answered my query by searching several inventories of important archive collections for Manlius without success, reports that "the office of the only person who could be called treasurer of Brabant, the so-called *r  cette g  n  rale*, was abolished at the end of the fifteenth century. And Manlius was certainly not the *Tr  sorier de la cour* since I did not find his name in the court accounts". Prof. Dr. Jozef IJsewijn has observed to me that *dux aulicus* is "a humanist equivalent of the mediaeval *major domus* or *senescallus* (court steward)". Whether Erasmus had a real person in mind seems to me extremely doubtful.

²⁴ On Angelo Poliziano of Montepulciano (14 July 1454-28/9 September 1494), see *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, III 106-8. Poliziano's correspondence contains many letters to Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. Here, however, the correspondent seems to be his nephew, Gianfrancesco Pico, Count of Mirandola.

²⁵ On Marsilio Ficino of Figline (19 October 1433-1 October 1499), who founded the Platonic Academy of Florence under Medici patronage, see *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, II 27-30. Erasmus met the Italian humanist Fausto Andrelini of Forl   (c. 1462-25 February 1518) in Paris in 1495 through Robert Gaguin and remained in periodic contact with him until 1511. See *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, I 53-56.

²⁶ Incorrectly Dolobellae in 1509 and 1515 *Syntaxis*. In the following salutation, the 1515 *Syntaxis* corrects to Dolabella. See *Ep. Fam.* IX.ix-xiv for Cicero's correspondence with his son-in-law, Publius Cornelius Dolabella.

[fol. 133, R7^r] Dolabella Terentiae socruī S. D.

Aesopus histrio Dinatio argentario S. D.

Aristippus epicuraeus Thaidi meretrici S. D.

Illud dignum quod admoneatur ne per inscitiam sordida cognomina pro speciosis attribuamus, veluti si quis *milem* scriberet pro *equite aurato* aut *decurione*, neve his vulgo jactatis magistratuum vocabulis utamur quae passim pro suo cuiusque locus arbitrio fingit, quod genus sunt *locumtenens* pro *praefecto*, *reddituarius* pro *quaestore aerario*, *scultetus* pro *quaestore paricidio*, *domini de parlamento* pro *selectis iudicibus*, *ammiraldus*²⁷ pro *maris* vel *littoris praefecto* vel *custode*, *heraldus* pro *caduceatore*, atque huiusmodi infinita quae aulicorum levitatis quotidie epistola comminiscitur. Oportebit itaque veterum vocabula barbaris conferre, atque inde collatis rebus ad nostra vocabula ducere; aut si deerit vox vetus quam rei novae accommodemus, barbaram iamque tritam vocem molliter in Latinam faciem deflectamus. Haec doctissimus Herasmus²⁸.

NOVAE SALUTANDI FORMULAE EX EODEM

Pliniano demum saeculo natum videtur ut quos familiarius ament, eos in salute dicenda suos dicerent, blandiore scilicet pronomine conjunctissimam necessitudinem significantes, ut: *C.*²⁹ *Plinius Caecilius Calphurnio suo S. D.* *Ausonius Symmacho suo S. D.* *Herasmus Batto S. D.*³⁰ Quod si longius a majorum vestigiis recedimus, *Iacobus Tutor Nicolao suo multam salutem precatur* aut *plurimam salutem optat*; nam *plurimas* aut *mille salutes* vix in epistolis tulerim. *Salve multum optime Chreme. Campanus Papiensis suum N. multum salvere jubet*³¹. *Etiam atque etiam salve, mi Thoma. Ave et salve, praeceptor optime. Herasmus Fausto feliciter agere. Celso gaudere et bene rem agere*³². *Antonius fratri suavissimo perpetuam*

²⁷ *Syntaxis* 1509 and 1515: ammirandus; ASD: Ammiraldus.

²⁸ Compare ASD I-2 286.7-87.14.

²⁹ *Syntaxis* 1509 and 1515: Ae.

³⁰ On Erasmus' friendship with Jacob Batt of Bergen-op-Zoom (c. 1466-1502), which probably began in 1494, see *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, I 100-1.

³¹ I have not been able to identify Campanus Papiensis. Erasmus was well acquainted with the letters of another Campanus: Giovanni Antonio Campano of Cavelli (1429-15 July 1477), a principal member of the literary circle of Pope Pius II (*Contemporaries of Erasmus*, I 252). Papiensis makes one think of Iacopo Ammannati Piccolomini, the Cardinalis Papiensis, whose *Epistolae et Commentarii* were printed at Milan 1506.

³² In the authorized edition, Erasmus quotes Horace, *Ep.* I 8.1: *Celso gaudere, et bene rem gerere Albinouano* (ASD I-2 277.17).

*optat incolumitatem. Salvere te jubeo qui ipse non salveo. Salutem dico tibi, mi patruē, quam ipse desidero. Salutem solidam tibi tua Phyllis precatur, quam ipsa nullam nisi tu dederis est habitura. Salutem is tibi mittit qui ipse periit. Salva sit tua paternitas. Salve animae dimidium meae. Salve meum praesidium. Salve meum numen. Salve meum delictum. Salve meus ignis, mea lux, mea spes, mea voluptas, mi anime, mea vita, meum solatium, meum dulce decus, et huiusmodi quidem formas, ut inter familiares et in levioribus argumentis non usque quaque damno, ita non magnopere probo. Haec Erasmus cuius et ea sunt quae modo subjiciam*³³.

[fol. 133, R7v] QUOMODO PER ALIOS SALUTANDUM ET
RESALUTANDUM: HERASMUS

Per alios autem (id enim hoc loco videbatur admodum) his saepe monendis salutem dicimus ac reddimus: *Atticae nostrae meis verbis multam salutem dicito. Atticam meo nomine magnopere salvere jubebis. Atticae ex me plurimam salutem dices. Atticam mea causa salutabis officiose. Familiam omnem per te meis verbis salutatam volo. Atticae pro me multam optabis salutem. Jussit tibi ascribi Scerbonius plurimam salutem. Antonius meique omnes meis verbis multam tibi salutem annunciant. Terentia multam tibi salutem impertit*³⁴.

SIC REDDITUR: HERASMUS

*Attica, quam tuis verbis dixi salutem, libenter accepit atque vicissim per meas litteras salvere jussit. Tuam salutem Attica libenter accepit, suam remittit. Ambrosius salutem, quam in tuis verbis nunciavi, totidem verbis renunciat. Attica, per me tuo nomine salutata, suis verbis ut te diligenter salutarem jussit. Atticae tuis verbis salutem scripsi; ea suis rescribi tibi multam salutem jussit. Haec Erasmus*³⁵.

SUPERSCRIPTIO

... Desyderius Erasmus ait: Haud longe quidem absunt ab assentatione epitheta (quae Fabius 'apposita' vertit) honoris gratia subjicienda, maximeque si salutationi permisceantur. Verum cognomina in scriptio-

³³ Compare ASD I-2 287.15-88.11.

³⁴ Compare ASD I-2 288.12-89.7. At ASD I-2 522-23, Erasmus addresses a sample *expostulatoria epistola* to Scribonius, perhaps Cornelius Grapheus of Aalst. Professor Fantazzi has suggested to me that he might be the Scerbonius mentioned here.

³⁵ Compare ASD I-2 289.8-15.

nibus, quae in terga litterarum supponi solent, tolerari possunt, et in ipsa epistola saepe usui sunt. Spectari diligenter oportet vel quae cuiusque hominis sunt partes quaeque a quibus virtutes expectentur, ut hinc apposita unicuique epitheta tribuamus. Haec ille ...³⁶.

[fol. 134, R8^v] HERASMUS

Atque haec quidem cautio sit oportet ne quae solum aliis congruunt in alios transferamus, veluti si quis puellam *venerandam* aut senem *jucundissimum* nominet, verumetiam ne quando manifeste³⁷ falsa tribuamus, ut indoctum theologum *gravissimum* potius dicas quam *eruditissimum*, praesulem supinum quidvis potius quam *vigilantem*, regem avarum *clementem* magis quam *munificum*. Nam quisque sibi conscius haec in contumeliam trahit non aliter quam si deformem senem *formasam puellam* appelles. Haec Erasmus³⁸.

EX EODEM

Potentia epitheta in salutatione vix tulero nisi siqua forte Gnatonismum non habebunt, ut *Ambrosius Laurentio Mellito nepoti* [fol. 135, S1^r] *S. D.*; *Tullius Tulliae filiae jucundissimae S. D.*; et caetera. In inscriptionibus autem modeste adhibere cuipiam licet, sed hominis nomine praelato, siquidem imperiosissima rerum consuetudo patiat, hunc in modum: *Iacobo Tutori juris pontificii consultissimo reddatur Handwerpiae agenti*³⁹; *Fausto Andreliano poetae divino*. Etiam si nunc receptum est, ut assentatiuncula nominum anteferatur hunc in modum, *Ornatissimo viro magistro Antonio patricio Romano*, malui ego bonarum litterarum studiosos cum his assentationibus cumque vulgata consuetudine velisque (ut aiunt) pugnare. Varie pro materia utemur epithetis, veluti principem, a quo muneris quippiam coneris auferre cuive munere accepto gratias agas, intempestive *fortissimum*, *invictissimum* appellaris;

³⁶ Compare ASD I-2 289.16-91.8. In the authorized edition Erasmus allows the use of epithets in the middle of a letter, where they play a part in persuasion, but he says nothing in this section about their use in the address on the back of the letter.

³⁷ *Sic Syntaxis* 1509 and 1515; ASD: manifesto.

³⁸ Compare ASD I-2 291.9-17.

³⁹ Tutor was appointed with Adrian Herbouts as successor to Antony Ysebrant, pensionary or chief magistrate of Antwerp, by the end of 1505 and took the oath of office on 10 February 1506 (HCT II 110 n. 2). He retained the position until 1536 and served on several embassies for the city, including one to England in 1509, where he negotiated with Thomas More. The reference to Tutor as *Handwerpiae agens* perhaps provides a *terminus post quem* for Erasmus' completion of the manuscript that Despauterius saw.

rectius munificentissimum aut benignissimum nominaturus. Ignosces primo errori, dux mitissime. Patere te exorari, clementissime Caesar⁴⁰. Turcarum vim a Christianorum humeris depelle, rex invicte. Restitue per calumniam oppressum, aequissime iudex. In bonam partem accipias, vir humanissime. Non meum est tibi consilium impertiri, vir prudentissime. In huiusmodi orationis genere, non sunt speciosa epitheta, sed argumenti pondus obtinent. Haec ex Erasmo⁴¹.

DE TRANSFIGURANDIS EPITHETIS EX EODEM

Transfigurantur haec adjectiva non ineleganter in substantiva, itaque pronominis vicem tenent. Obsecro te, pater piissime; obsecro tuam pietatem, pater. Gratulor tibi, vir fortissime; gratulor tuae fortitudini, et caetera. Tuam, inquam, improbitatem appello, id est, te improbe, et caetera. His si modice et in loco utamur, et graviorem amplificando reddemus orationem, et grata varietate nominabimus. Nam vulgo in his nullus est modus, neque in loco faciunt, hoc modo: dominationis tuae litteras accepimus, et reverendissima tua praesentia mihi significavit, et charitati tuae breviter respondeo, et nostra parvitas dignissimae paternitati tuae gratias agit. Haec ex Erasmo. Eiusdem studii dicuntur contirones, inquit idem, cuius sunt et haec. Illa recte. Stultitiae meae tua prudentia sit praesidio. Nostram tenuitatem tua liberalitas foveat. Nostram inopiam tua copia sustineat⁴².

DE SERVITUTE EPITHETORUM EX EODEM

Fugienda est infelicitas eorum qui se certis quibusdam vocibus alligant, quas, magna superstitione, immutari aut verso proferri ordine, piaculum putant, ut pontificem summum, sanctissimum patrem [fol. 135, S1^v] tantum dicamus, episcopum, reverendum, abbatem, venerabilem, regem, Christianissimum, ducem, illustrem, comitem, generosum, neque fas esse haec inter se commutari. Ego miserrimum puto servire vocabulis⁴³. Quid enim si regem pro patriae salute sese periculis objicientem piissimum dixerō? Ridebit me crasso Vulphanius ore⁴⁴. Quid si summum

⁴⁰ Sic Syntaxis 1515; Syntaxis 1509: *pater te exorare claementissime caesar*.

⁴¹ Compare ASD I-2 291.18-92.7.

⁴² Compare ASD I-2 292.8-293.7.

⁴³ Syntaxis 1509 and 1515: *serviri*; Ars epistolica 1513: *servire*.

⁴⁴ Sic Syntaxis 1509 and 1515; Ars epistolica 1513: *Vulfernus*; ASD: *Calphurnius*. All three names are apparently fictitious, but Erasmus may have had in mind a verse of Persius, V 190: *crassum ridet Pulfenius ingens*.

pontificem *optimum maximumque pastorem*, non *optime*, dixerō? At isti aliud *dominus Petrus* et *Petrus dominus*, deque his tricis doctissimi scilicet homines sudantes disputant. Quid si utrunque juxta sit barbarum? Conditionis nomen *dominus* est, non honoris, tyrannum, non magnificum. Nam et lenonem cui mancipia sunt *dominum* recte dixeris. *Magistrum nostrum* si dicas, theologum intelligunt; *nostrum magistrum* istum posse vocari qui gregem agat. Tantillum interest inter agrestem caprarium et caelestem theologum! Tune, o theologie tetricae, morum censor et gravitatis columen, his nugis tibi places? Tune, dogma professus, quod vetuit venerabile nomen affectaremus, cristas canas erigis quoties *magister noster* appellaris? +Quam+ diluturus si quis *noster* magicum illud pronomen praetulerit? Magica sunt ista, non oratoria, et ab aulicis assentatoribus in stabulis aut in symposiis conficta. Indignissima vere quae ludis litterariis importentur⁴⁵. Haec eloquentissimus orator et poeta Desyderius Herasmus Roterodamus, qui optimo jure debacchatur plurimum in pluraliter uni loquentes, quos ipse *voscitatores* nominat⁴⁶. Multis rationibus probat apertissime, nullum esse honorem unicum plurative compellare. Sed quid ego (inquit) nunc belluas istas litteras doceam? Etenim si oleum et operam perdit qui asinos ducit ad lyram, multo maxime qui vetulos asinos⁴⁷? Nam si probatos grammaticos adimus, in prima persona mutatur numerus persaepe aut modestiae aut festivitatis aut euphoniae gratia; in tertia persona vero raro, sed eisdem de causis excepta modestia; porro in secunda persona nunquam nisi invidiae causa mutandus est numerus, quod genus sunt illa: *Ubi ad uxores ventum est, tum fiunt senes*, et *quae vestra libido*, unde repente quod invidiosum tot saeculis fuit, honorificum esse coepit⁴⁸. Si de se loqui pluraliter modesti est, alteri loqui plurative maligni atque invidi sit necesse est. *Oro vestram humanitatem* unicum erit mendum. Nempe vulgaris honor. *Oro reverendissimas humanitates vestras*, bene duplicatum vitium, mediocris honor et ferendus. Adde tertium, plenam inieris gratiam: *Oro reverendissimas paternitates vestras, domine praestantis-*

⁴⁵ Compare ASD I-2 293.15-95.13, where, however, the satirical address to *magistri nostri* has been omitted. This passage is apparently corrupt in both the 1509 and 1515 *Syntaxis*: Tu ne dogma professus qui vetuit venerabile nomen affectaremus. Cristas canas erigis quoties magister noster appellaris. 'quam' (quā in the original) does not yield any satisfactory sense. Perhaps read 'quasi'.

⁴⁶ Compare ASD I-2 266.14-67.1.

⁴⁷ *Adagia* I iv 62: *Oleum et operam perdidit*; I iv 35: *Asinus ad lyram* (CWE XXXI).

⁴⁸ *Syntaxis* 1509 and 1515: *ubi ad te uxoris ventum est, tum fiunt senes*; ASD: *Quum ad uxores ventum est, tum fiunt senes*.

sime. Cumulatissimam vis inire gratiam? Quadrigam [fol. 136, S2^r] barbaris morum facito hunc in modum: Oro reverendissimas paternitates vestras, domine praestantissime, domine praesul. Euge euge! Iste demum honorificentissimus est sermo. Cuius siquis spurcitiam non videt, illiteratissimus sit necesse est. Si cum videat, non expuit, patientissimus; si tam absurdam assentationem libentius etiam auribus haurit, gloriosissimus etiam sit oportet, Haec et multo plura in levissimos nebulones, doctissimus orator et poeta Herasmus⁴⁹.

VALE QUOMODO FACIENDUM

Clauduntur Ciceronis epistolae ferme hoc verbo *vale*, cui vix unquam quippiam adjicit; possumus et sic vale facere, ut Herasmus cum Mancinello docet: *Mea Terentia vale. Vale mi suavissime frater. Mea spes vale. Vale mea lux, et caetera. Communem valitudinem fac cures. Si tu recte vales, nos male valere non poterimus. Valitudini tuae, siquidem nos valere vis, omni cura servi Si quid erit (inquit Herasmus) quod magnopere volumus eius animo insidere, id vale subnectimus. Etenim quae novissimae dicuntur in discessu, ea recentissime meminisse solemus ut: Vale, nosque, quod facis, ama. Vale mi Cicero, et hoc unum memento, te inter venena vivere. Vale; valebis autem si philosophiam amplecteris. Vale, et ubicumque eris, mortalem te cogita. Vale nostri memor. Vale, et nominis immortalitati, mi frater, incumbere. Subdit idem: Illud bellum, quoties iam scripto vale, tum demum quippiam in mentem fingemus venire, hunc ad modum: Vale. At heus tu, propemodum praeterieram, quod in primis dictum oportuit. Vale, sed deum immortalem, quia paene exciderat quod nequitiam praeteritum oportuit⁵⁰. Vale. Iam parabam epistolam obsignare, sed propter otium obtigit, libet etiam diutius tecum garrere. Vale, sed iam percommode in mentem incidit. Vale. At nunc demum occurrit quod primo loco scriptum oportuit. Vale: paene sero soceri tui recordabar. Vale. Iam cerae anulum admoveram; mirum quam paene me fugerit. Vale, sed mane dum de fratre nunc denique succurrebat. [fol. 136, S2^r] Vale, sed priusquam obsignem epistolam, hoc addam. Vale. Iam epistolam complicabam dum ecce mihi de filia tua succurrit. Huiusmodi formae non hoc tantum loco verum etiam passim gratiam habent, si quid Fabio credimus. Subjicit idem doctissimus Herasmus: quidam*

⁴⁹ Compare ASD I-2 266.9-76.14, especially 269.12-72.17.

⁵⁰ In *Syntaxis* 1509 and 1515, an abbreviation (for *quam* or *quem*?) follows *quia*; in *Ars epistolica* 1513, a similar abbreviation appears, but *quia* is omitted.

hunc in modum valere jubent: *Incolumem servet immortalis deus. Humanitatem tuam feliciter agere precor. Praestantissimam tuam florentem et incolumem tueatur deus clementiam. Sanctitatem tuam in omni prosperitate confirmet propitius Jesus*. Haec quidem, ut non reprahendo, ita istas assuetas appendices non fero: *Vale in eo qui vastum cingit fluctibus orbem. Valentem te tueatur qui mare et terras variis mundum temperat horis*. Nisi quod assuitur pulchre cum epistola cohaereat ...⁵¹.

QUID POST VALE

Post vale subditur locus tempusque in hunc modum: *datum* vel *scriptum Romae*, vel in ablativo *Roma* sine praepositione, vel cum praepositione, *ex Roma*. Docet hoc Herasmus. Sic *datum Luteciae* vel *Lutecia*, qui Parrhisii nunc dicuntur; sed *datum* et *scriptum* venustius subauditur sic: *Vale ex aula regia, e diversorio, e cellula nostra, ruri vel rure vel ex rure, ex hortis, a coena, ex cubiculo, ad lucernam, e caupona, ad lunam*, et caetera. Deinde subditur tempus in hunc modum: *Gandavi* vel *Gandavo* vel *ex Gandavo noctis conticinio, alta nocte, profunda nocte, plurima nocte, nocte concubia, sub gallicinium*, et caetera⁵². Diem notabimus sic: *Vale Gandavi calendis Martiis*, et caetera, in ablativo, quia significatur tempus (ut ita dicam) quando, quod in ablativo exprimitur, vel in accusativo cum praepositione *ad*, ut: *Vale ex Ipris ad calendas Martias*. Badius et plures⁵³ dicunt hic significari diem incertum, ut sit *ad calendas juxta* vel *circiter calendas*, sic *ad nonas, ad idus*, de quibus mox agemus. Non placet hoc Desyderio Herasmo Roterdamo, sic scribenti: *Tertio calendas Junias*, vel *ad tertium calendas Junias* vel *Junii*, et caetera. Sic veteres quidem omnes. Nam quod his temporibus a principio mensis, reliquos deinceps numerant, id uti neotericum est, ita indoctum, vige-

⁵¹ Compare ASD I-2 295.14-98.6.

⁵² Compare ASD I-2 298.7-99.1.

⁵³ Josse Bade of Ghent (c. 1461-December 1535) wrote and edited a number of books for various printers at Lyon and Paris before establishing his own press at Paris in 1503. Among his works is *De epistolarum compositione compendium isagogicum*, which first appeared in an edition of Cicero's *Epistolae ad familiares* in 1502. It was frequently reprinted under various titles by Bade and others, sometimes in collections of treatises on grammar and letter-writing that included Giovanni Sulpizio's *De componendis ornandisque epistolis* (Venice: C. de Pensis, 1489) and Agostino Dati's *Elegantiolae* or *Isagogicus libellus pro conficiendis epistolis et orationibus* (Ferrara: Andrea Belfortis, 1471), on which Bade wrote a commentary (*Imprimeurs et libraires parisiens du XVI^e siècle*, II 52, 91, 103, 123; cf. Philippe Renouard, *Bibliographie de Josse Bade Ascensius*, Paris 1908, pp. 109-10, and *Contemporaries of Erasmus* I 79-81, 378; III 300).

simo primo die mensis Julii, ubi hae duae voces et *die* et *mensis* contra veterum consuetudinem redundant. Scribendum igitur erat pro undecima die mensis Julii, *quinto idus Julias* vel *Julii*. Errant enim, qui praepositionem *ad* additam, existimant semper tempus reddere incertum⁵⁴. [fol. 137, S3^r] Marcus Tullius Cicero saepicule diem ascribebat *ad xv. calendas Februarias*; non ita potus scribebat ut de quo die scriberet ipse nesciverit⁵⁵. At si quando de tempore ambigetur, hoc pacto scribendum erit: *anno circiter nonagesimo, ad annos circiter nonaginta, ad annos ferme nonaginta*. Haec Herasmus⁵⁶. Annum signare docet idem sic: *Anno a Christo nato millesimo quingentesimo. Anno ab homine redempto post millesimum quingentesimo octavo. Anno a Christo passo quingentesimo supra millesimum. Anno a virginis partu millesimo quingentesimo*, et caetera. Sic Christiani; olim vero ab olympiadum et consulatuum numero. Item anno *a natali Christiano*, et caetera, pulchrius quam *a nativitate Christi*⁵⁷.

CALENDAE, NONAE, ET IDUS

[fol. 137, S3^v] ... Quod si quem (inquit Herasmus) novitas capit, per ferias, id quod vulgo faciunt, poterit indicare hoc pacto: *feriis natalitiis, pridie natalis Ambrosiani; pridie natalitia virginis matris; pridie Pentecostes*; et caetera⁵⁸ ...

EPISTOLAE QUALITAS

[fol. 138, S4^r] ... Verum audiamus aliquantisper suavissimum Herasmm in barbaros nebulones justissime stomachantem his modis: Nul- lum verbum non usitatum puto videri quod ab elegantis scriptoris exeat

⁵⁴ *Syntaxis* 1509 and 1515: Errant enim qui praepositionem additam incertam; ASD: Errant autem, qui praepositionem *ad* additam, existimant semper tempus reddere incertum.

⁵⁵ *Syntaxis* 1509 and 1515: Marcus Tullius Cicero saepicule diem ascribat *ad xv. calendas Februarias*, non ita potus scribebat ut de quo die scriberet ipse nesciverit; ASD: Etenim quum M. Tullius frequenter sic ascribit diem: *Ad XV. Cal. Febr.*, num ita potus erat, vt quo die scriberet ipse nesciret?

⁵⁶ Compare ASD I-2 299.11-300.5.

⁵⁷ Compare ASD I-2 299.1-11. The example, *Anno ab homine redempto post millesimum quingentesimo octavo*, is not found in the authorized edition, although similar expressions are: *Anno ab orbe redempto, post millesimum quingentesimo Anno ab hominum genere restituto* (ASD I-2 299.4-5). The date 1508 cannot be trusted as evidence that Erasmus wrote the manuscript in that year, since Despauterius might easily have modified Erasmus' example.

⁵⁸ Compare ASD I-2 300.9-11.

litteris. Quid Cicerone candidius apertiusque? At hic barbasculis⁵⁹ istis videtur tenebris involutus. Quid Terentiano sermone luculentius? At hunc ne commentariis quidem adjutus intelligis. Hieronymi etiam si tibi videris ne tres quidem versiculos percipis. Hos si obscuros damnabis, pulcherrimum judicabo, cum talibus viris commune crimen subire. Obscuri sunt, sed tibi; doctis apertissimi. Ergo in te tenebrae istae sunt, non in litteris. Tu quemcunque authorem incideris modo laudatum, noctem istam tecum circumfers. Spinosum clamas esse Hieronymum, verum non locus, sed tui pedes spinas habent. Caligas in sole, et lux ista tuis nocturnis oculis pro tenebris est. Mutandus est (inquiunt) stilus, qui quoquo modo tamen non intelligitur. At quanto satius est te tuum mutare vitium quam nos rectissimas disciplinas tuo vitio accommodare? Nos divinam linguam, cui tot artes, cui nostra religio commissa est, intermori sinemus, ne tuam indoctam arrogantiam offendamus? Mutabit Philomela cum cuculo modos suos propterea quod asello iudice hic plane, illa involute canere videatur? Ego vero protritas istas, id est barbaras voces, adeo non requiro, ut nec iis quidem succensere soleam, qui priscas a scriptorum etiam consuetudine remotas eruunt. Neque indignor objectum esse quod non intelligam, sed oblatum gaudeo quod discam. Tu contra mavis alienam doctrinam reprehendere, quam tuam incitiam aut agnoscere modeste aut mutare prudenter. Mavis solem deculpare, quam lippientes oculos tonsori Licino committere. Et vide interim, quam studiose iniquus sis⁶⁰. Paulopost subjicit: Neque vero haec tam studiose disserimus, quod eruditam simplicitatem contemnimus, quip- [fol. 138, S4^v] pe quae non solum incredibilis cuiusdam est artificii, verumetiam felicitatis, utut veram perspicuitatem a veris tenebris separamus⁶¹. Paulopost: in epistolis vel Ciceronis exemplo, licet Graeca miscere Latinis, obscuris illusionibus uti, amphibolis, significationibus, paroemiis, aenigmatibus, clausulis de repente praecisis. Ubi multa etiam dedita opera obscuramus, ne forte a quo minime volumus, intelligantur⁶². Cuiusmodi debeat esse epistola, declarat idem Herasmus his verbis: Eam ego epistolam optimam judico quae a vulgato hoc litterarum genere

⁵⁹ Erasmus illustrates his point by daring to use a word found only in Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* XV 5.3. *Barbasculo* was accepted in the *editio princeps* (Rome, 1469) and as late as 1903 by C. Hosius (rptd. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1959), but P. K. Marshall (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968) accepts the emendation proposed by W. Heraeus in *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 24 (1904), 1163-71: *barunculo*.

⁶⁰ Compare ASD I-2 219.1-21.1.

⁶¹ Compare ASD I-2 221.9-12.

⁶² Compare ASD I-2 221.15-22.

quam longissime recedat; quae sententiis exquisitissimis, verbis electissimis constet⁶³; quae argumento, loco, personae sit maxime accommodata; quae amplis de rebus agens, sit gravissima, de mediocribus, concinna, de humilibus, elegans; in jocis acumine placeat et lepore; in demonstrationibus, apparata, in exhortando, fortis et animosa, in consolando, blanda, in suadendo, gravis, in narrando, graphica, laetis in rebus, festiva, in afflictis, luctuosa. Et ne quae sunt infinita persequar, sit versipellis, et ut polypus, ad subjecti soli habitum, ita se ad argumenta accommodet⁶⁴. Paulopost: temporum, personarum in primis habebit rationem, ut aliter seni loquatur, aliter adulescentulis, aliter severis, aliter iis qui festiviore sunt ingenio, aliter aulicis, aliter philosophis, aliter familiaribus, aliter autem ignotis aut parum bene cupientibus⁶⁵. Et non multo post: breviuscula occupato, fucator curioso, priscis verbis antiquario, blandior amico, licentior familiari, asperior improbo⁶⁶. Et tandem concludit: Qui unam quandam sermonis formam huic generi tribuere conantur, hi non solum inanem, sed etiam ridiculam operam sumunt⁶⁷.

QUIS EPISTOLAE CHARACTER EX HERASMO

Desyderius Herasmus Roterodamus, amoenissimo ingenio et poeta et orator, de quo verissime dici potest, *Major in exiguo regnabat corpore virtus*⁶⁸, videtur mihi de arte epistolari inter caeteros doctissime scriptitasse; ideo libentius sum eius quam aliorum aut mea denique praecepta complexus. Ait itaque: qui in epistolis unum quempiam characterem aut requirunt aut praescribunt (id quod ab eruditioribus etiam video factum), ii mihi nimirum de re prope in infinitum varia nimis agere videntur, neque multo minus absurde facere quam sutor si omni pedi crepidas eadem forma velit consuere. Haec multis probat⁶⁹. Tum ex Cicerone, Seneca, Hieronymo, aliisque qui epistolas in volumina usque porrectas scripserunt nonnullas, deridet eos qui magicam quandam brevitatem in epistolis servandam praedicant, ex Seneca dicente in Epistola XLV: *sed ne epistolae modum excedam. quae non debet sinistram manum legentis implere, in alium diem hanc litem cum dialecticis diffe-*

⁶³ *Syntaxis* 1509 and 1515 and *Ars epistolica* 1513: constat; ASD: constet.

⁶⁴ Compare ASD I-2 222.16-23.6.

⁶⁵ Compare ASD I-2 223.8-13.

⁶⁶ Compare ASD I-2 223.21-24.

⁶⁷ Compare ASD I-2 224.2-3.

⁶⁸ Statius, *Thebais*, I 417, in reference to Tydeus.

⁶⁹ Compare ASD I-2 209.4-9 and ff.

*ram*⁷⁰. Haec [fol. 139, S5^r] ille, qui sinistram manum legentis impleri significat cum longior fuerit epistola, tunc enim et dextera et sinistra teneri necesse est. Quid (inquit Herasmus) si mihi argumentum amplum et copiosum objectum erit, tu nihilo minus me circulum istum tuum magicum egredi vetabis⁷¹? Post multa subdit: Neque interim ulla epistola non brevis videbitur in qua praeter argumenti dispendium nihil adimere possis⁷². Sed ante dixit: Neque haec dixerim, quod eos probem qui, ridicule copiam affectantes, emendicatis oculis et male consutis epistolam infarciunt⁷³. Contra eos qui epistolam illaboratam esse volunt, ne lucernam oleat, sic dicit Herasmus: Istorum vero litterae non lucernam olent, sed hircum. Quis porro adeo est demens qui non eas litteras optimas esse iudicet quae sunt omni arte curaue elucubratae ac elaboratae⁷⁴? Et post compluscula, sic concludit: Scribito quod in buccam venerit, sed ita ut ad Atticum fecit Cicero⁷⁵. De gravitate epistolae, statim subdit: Nam illos qui epistolarum figuram quotidiano sermoni quam proximam esse oportere contendunt, vel una Ciceronis epistola ad Octavium scripta facile convicerit, quae non ad orationis modo procellas attollitur, sed in tragoediam usque exit, et caetera⁷⁶. Concludit Herasmus: Effervescet ergo vel in tragicam usque vociferationem epistola, si quando res ita expostulabit, sumetque ampullas et sesquipedalia verba. Neque maximis de rebus perinde ut de macerandis salsamentis et holeribus coquendis loquetur. Caeterum in mediocribus argumentis non displicebit Atticismus, ita si sermo veluti e fonticulo limpidis aquis leniter fluat, non veluti sentina sordes trahat⁷⁷. Magis noscenda quam nota scribas, si brevis esse cupis. Ita rerum pones exitus comico illo artificio, ut ex iis quae praecesserunt conjiciantur. Eius ad quem scribimus epistolae argumentum recensere supersedebimus, sed id nostris ex argumentis divinandum relinquemus. Quod genus sunt illa: *Quae narras? Antonius episcopus? Quem lupo commisisti? Quod de filiae partu scribas, voluptatem mihi magnam nuncias*. Aliter Angelus Politianus suo quodam instituto interim factitavit⁷⁸. Alibi concludit Herasmus sic:

⁷⁰ Compare ASD I-2 211.6 and ff. *Syntaxis* 1509 and 1515 incorrectly cite Seneca Ep. XV as the source of this quotation.

⁷¹ Compare ASD I-2 211.11-13.

⁷² Compare ASD I-2 213.9-10.

⁷³ Compare ASD I-2 212.10-12.

⁷⁴ Compare ASD I-2 214.1-6.

⁷⁵ Compare ASD I-2 215.11-12.

⁷⁶ Compare ASD I-2 215.13-16.3.

⁷⁷ Compare ASD I-2 216.11-17.4.

⁷⁸ Compare ASD I-2 225.22-26.12.

Ex omni authorum genere quam purissimam Romani sermonis vim et suppellectilem comparemus; quae, si suppetet, artem in epistola non admodum efflagitabimus, si deerit, risum etiam movebit artis affectatio. Haec Herasmus⁷⁹. Sunt etiam pulcherrima in epistolis adagia, modo sint rara, quae ab Herasmo planissime elucidantur, et a Vergilio Polidoro non illepide, nec non in *Epistolis proverbialibus* Fausti poetae in primis divini miro artificio colliguntur ac digeruntur⁸⁰. Themata vel materias (ut vocant) docet dare venustissime Herasmus; nam sumere debemus ex poetis, historicis, caeterisque, non de nugis et calceis resarciendis, ut vulgo faciunt triviales, sed omnium pessime, quorum discipuli [fol. 139, S5v] nunquam discunt epistolas componere, et plus tamen placent inepto popello istorum nugae quam quorundam doctorum seria. Verum et sua riserunt saecula Maeonidem⁸¹. Abruptum et paene satyricum initium in joco et in familiaribus mire delectat, ut: *Siccine veterem amiculum negligis? Eho, quid agis, obsecro?* et caetera⁸². ... De exordiis, narrationibus, generibus causarum — deliberativo, demonstrativo, et judiciali — de exemplis caeterisque non dictis, ab Herasmo vel Sulpitio⁸³ doceri poteris, sed a nullis melius quam Cicerone et Quintiliano, totius eloquentiae luminibus.

⁷⁹ Compare ASD I-2 227.5-9.

⁸⁰ Polidoro Virgilio of Urbino (c. 1470-18 April 1555), who is best known for his *Anglica historia* (Basel: Johann Bebel, 1534), also published *Proverbiorum libellus* (Venice: C. de Pensis, 1498) and other works. Erasmus denied charges that he had borrowed from Virgilio's collection of proverbs for his own *Adagia* (Paris: J. Philippi, June 1500). Perhaps he saw the second edition of Virgilio's work (Venice: C. de Pensis, November 1500) rather than the first. There is more reason to believe that the *Epistolae proverbiales et morales* of Fausto Andrelini (Paris: J. Badius, 1508) influenced the *Adagia*, since Andrelini apparently began his collection before 1490 and Erasmus may have seen it in manuscript. See *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, III 397-99 and I 53-56. The authorized edition of Erasmus' *De conscribendis epistolis* contains a long section on teaching letter-writing (ASD I-2 227-66). The exercises that Erasmus recommends depend heavily on the use of proverbs as both sources of subject matter and ornaments of style.

⁸¹ Despauterius refers to Erasmus' discussion of teaching methods, which occupy three chapters — *Exercitatio et imitatio*, *Quomodo proponenda materia*, and *De emendando* — in the authorized edition. See ASD I-2 227-66, especially 231.6-35.16. Maeonides is a poetic name for Homer: Ovid, *Amores* III 9.25; Martial, V 10.8.

⁸² Compare ASD I-2 323.13-20.

⁸³ See n. 50 above.

Excerpt from *Johannis Despauterii Annotationes ad Syntaxim* ([Paris]: J. Badius, [1510]), Aa7^{r-v}:

[Aa7^r] CIRCA EPISTOLAS

[Aa7^v] Quis epistolae character ex Herasmo, huius artis peritissimo, enucleavimus, cui penitus suffragatur Angelus Politianus. In primo libro illustrium in prima epistola, quam omitto, quia⁸⁴ vulgo habetur, damnat certe Politianus diversis in locis eos quibus nihil placet quam quod Ciceronem prae se ferat, cum ii sint plerumque a Cicerone alienissimi. Qui de hac re multa scire velit, legat epistolam Angeli Politiani ad Paulum Cortesium cum responsione Cortesii ad Politianum⁸⁵.

⁸⁴ *Annotationes* [1510]: qua.

⁸⁵ On Poliziano's criticisms of such extreme Ciceronians as Paolo Cortesi, see my discussion above.

John N. GRANT

PIETRO BEMBO AND VAT. LAT. 3226

In 1503 Pietro Bembo composed a work which he was not to publish until 1530¹, a dialogue, dedicated to Ercole Strozza and entitled *De Virgiliti Culice et Terentii fabulis*. In the dialogue Bembo gives an account of a conversation which is supposed to have taken place in Rome, at least ten years earlier, between two famous Renaissance scholars, Pomponius Laetus and Hermolaus Barbarus². Bembo's information comes, he tells us, from his friend Phaedrus (Tommaso Inghirami). The subject of the conversation is the corrupt state of the surviving works of classical authors, and in particular of Latin poets³. After an introductory section in which some passages by different poets are briefly discussed the dialogue then falls into two main sections. The first deals with the text of the *Culex*, the second with the text of the plays of Terence. This combination of works in the same dialogue is no accident. Among the books and manuscripts of the library of Pietro's

¹ Pietro Bembo was in Rome in May and June of 1502, a visit to which he refers at the beginning of the dialogue: "cum superiore anno Romae ego et noster Quirinus essemus".

The National Union Catalogue (Vol. 45, p. 595) cites an edition of the dialogue published in Basel in 1513 and records that a copy of this edition is held by Harvard University and Yale University. Enquiries to both show that the Catalogue is in error. The mistake may have arisen from the presence of the *De imitatione* in the same volume of the 1530 edition and from the fact that the date of this disquisition of Bembo (given in the form of a letter) is 1 January 1513. In his request to the Venetian Senate for the *privilegium* to print his uncle's works in 1530 Giambetto Bembo distinguished between works which had already been printed and those which had not. The dialogue was in the latter category. See *Le epistole "De imitatione" di Giovanfrancesco Pico della Mirandola e di Pietro Bembo*, edited by G. Santangelo (Florence, 1954), p. 14, note 1.

² Hermolaus Barbarus died in 1493. A Venetian, he came to Rome as ambassador in May 1490. See E. Bigi, *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, VI (Rome, 1964), p. 97.

³ Its original title was probably *De corruptis poetarum locis*: see V. Cian, *Un decennio della vita di M. Pietro Bembo (1521-1531)* (Torino, 1885), p. 155; C. Dionisotti, *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, VIII (Rome, 1966), p. 137. Bembo seems to refer to this work as *De poetis* in a letter written to Vettor Soranzo on 13 September 1529: P. Bembo, *Opere* 4 vols (Venice, 1729), III, p. 153 (*Le lettere volgare*, 2.8.16).

father Bernardo were two especially prized possessions. One was a manuscript of Virgil, containing the *Bucolics*, part of the first book of the *Georgics*, and some of the *opuscula* (including the *Culex*) which were ascribed to Virgil. The other was an ancient manuscript of Terence. Both passed into the library of Fulvio Orsini and thence into the Vatican library⁴. They are now Vat. lat. 3252 and Vat. lat. 3226 respectively and among the witnesses for the transmission of the two works each is commonly referred to as the *codex Bembinus*. In the dialogue Pomponius is supposed to be the owner of the Virgilian manuscript, while the Terence manuscript is imagined to be the property of Hermolaus. Pomponius describes his manuscript as “perantiquus” (p. 306, col. 2 / f. a. viii^v)⁵ and “pervetustus” (p. 315, col. 2 / f. d. i^v), and the Terence manuscript is similarly described (cf. “librum ... Terentianum pervetustum” and “antiquo in libro” on p. 314, col. 2 / f. c. viii^r). In fact there is a difference of more than four centuries between the two manuscripts⁶. The Terence Bembinus is usually assigned to s. iv-v, while the Virgil is dated to the middle of the ninth century⁷. The Terence manuscript continues to be an extremely important witness to the text, but the Virgil, with the discovery of other manuscripts, has lost the esteemed position it once held for the transmission of the *Culex* and some other works in the *Appendix*⁸.

It is clear that the dialogue is a fabrication which is designed to enable

⁴ See P. de Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* (Paris, 1887), p. 95 ff., 239.

⁵ I give two references, the first to the fourth volume of the more accessible edition of Bembo's work, *Opere*, 4 vols (Venice, 1729), the second to the first edition (Venice, 1530).

⁶ On the terminology used by Renaissance scholars in their description of manuscripts see Silvia Rizzo, *Il lessico filologico degli umanisti* (Rome, 1973), pp. 147-68.

⁷ B. Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles*, 2 (Paris, 1985), p. 789, assigns the Virgil manuscript to s. ix 2/3, citing Bernhard Bischoff as his authority.

⁸ The manuscript tradition of the *Appendix Virgiliana* was examined in detail by F. Vollmer in 1908 in *Sitzungsberichte der Königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, 11. Abhandlung. His stemma was corrected by Wendell Clausen, “The textual tradition of the *Culex*”, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 68 (1964), 119-38, and E. Courtney, “The textual transmission of the the *Appendix Virgiliana*”, *Bulletin* [of the London] *Institute of Classical Studies*, 15 (1968), 133-40. See further M.D. Reeve, “The textual tradition of the *Aetna*, *Ciris*, and *Catalepton*”, *Maia*, 27 (1975), 231-47; id., “The textual tradition of the *Appendix Virgiliana*”, *Maia*, 28 (1976), 232-52, where there is much valuable information on the fifteenth-century manuscripts and the early printed editions. The result of all this is that while Vat. lat. 3252 is still an important witness for recovering the readings of a lost Carolingian manuscript, this lost manuscript is only one witness to one branch of the tradition.

Bembo to reveal information about these two manuscripts. Pomponius and Hermolaus are simply used as the means whereby details about the readings of the manuscripts can be made public. If the content had been presented in a more interesting manner than is actually the case, we might admire Bembo's method. But after the introduction the dialogue turns into a dry catalogue of quotations usually without any indication of the contributions which the two manuscripts make to improving the vulgate text of the *Culex* and the *fabulae*. A complete text of the *Culex* is given by Pomponius and just under ninety passages (some of them admittedly brief) from Terence are quoted by Hermolaus. Despite its unattractive nature, however, the dialogue allows us the opportunity to evaluate Bembo's accuracy and trustworthiness on the one hand, and his abilities as a textual critic on the other.

Both of these aspects are important, particularly with respect to the *Culex*. Bembo's text replaced the vulgate and became *the* text which was the starting point for such scholars as the younger Scaliger, Daniel Heinsius, and Nicolaus Heinsius. Of more recent editors Otto Ribbeck, Emil Baehrens, and Friedrich Vollmer still favoured readings offered by Bembo which later editors have abandoned. Ribbeck did so even though he believed that Bembo was being disingenuous when he made Pomponius say in the dialogue "sed est, Hermolae, plane mirum, in his versibus [233-64] quam perverse multa legantur. nam praeter eos ubi de Belidibus poeta deque Ity mentionem fecit, hi ipsi de Alcestide ita sunt immutati spectanturque alia facie in reliquis libris ac visuntur in nostro, ut verear si librum illum tibi legendum agnoscendumque non praebuero, ne existimes haec me invenisse de meo". Ribbeck's verdict on these words is that Bembo "more aetatis illius nebulas bono Hermolao fraudulenter praetexuit ut emendationes suas, quarum pars ne Vaticano nec ullo alio libro confirmatur, codicis auctoritate niti persuaderet"⁹.

In the Terence section of the dialogue a different problem has been identified. After saying that most of the *Andria* is missing from the ancient manuscript, or, to be more accurate, after implying that most of the text of this play is illegible, Hermolaus then quotes *An.* 346-8. But these lines are no longer to be found in the manuscript, in which the first substantial piece of text begins at *An.* 888. Was Bembo able to read parts of the codex which have since been lost? That is one question that remains to be answered. Other questions are whether Bembo has been

⁹ *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, 4 vols (Leipzig, 1859-68), IV (1868), p. 33.

accurate in the reporting of the readings of his codex and (one that is particularly pertinent to what has just been said about the *Culex*) whether Bembo has introduced in this section of the dialogue any conjectures of his own, as he had done in the section dealing with the *Culex*.

An examination of Bembo's contributions to the text of the *Culex* and of his fidelity to the readings of Vat. lat. 3252 will not be taken up in this article. Only that part of the dialogue which deals with the text of the plays of Terence will be studied here, although the answers to the questions just enunciated will have implications too for evaluating what Bembo has done in the first part of the dialogue¹⁰.

In 1491 Angelo Poliziano was in Venice, and while there he collated the famous Terence manuscript which Bernardo Bembo owned. Pietro, then in his twenty-first year, assisted Poliziano in the collation¹¹. The printed edition of Terence which Poliziano used during the collation to note the readings of the Bembinus survives and is now in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence (Banco Rari 97)¹².

Recently there has been brought to light evidence which demonstrates that the famous codex was not in exactly the same state in the late fifteenth century or early sixteenth century as it is now. Riccardo Ribuoli used the collation of the Bembinus by Angelo Poliziano as recorded in his printed Terence edition to show that parts of the outer edges of what is now fol. 4 (containing *An.* 925-48 and 949-71) were lost *after* Poliziano collated the manuscript¹³. A similar kind of loss, of part of

¹⁰ I plan to address the topic of the sources of the readings which Bembo offers in the *Culex* in a subsequent article.

¹¹ See Riccardo Ribuoli, *La collazione Poliziana del codice Bembo di Terenzio* (Rome, 1981), for an excellent and detailed account of the collation. This article was in part prompted by Ribuoli's work and owes much to it. His early death perhaps prevented his further investigation of the topic of this article to which he had contributed much.

¹² This edition was printed in 1475 and was thought to be the product of the Milanese press of Antonio Zarotto (so D. Reichling, *Appendices ad Hainii-Copingeri Repertorium bibliographicum* (Munich, 1905-1914), no. 18790), but it has been suggested that it may be the work of Adamus de Ambergau in Venice; see *Indice generale degli incunaboli delle biblioteche d'Italia* (Rome, 1972), no. 9422. See also G. Cupaiuolo, *Bibliografia terenziana (1470-1983)* (Naples, 1984), no. 27, and Ribuoli, *La collazione*, p. 17, note 7.

It is almost certain that Poliziano acquired the edition in Venice for the particular purpose of recording the collation. He also possessed an edition of Terence published in Naples in 1470. This is now in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (D'Elci 194): see L. C. Martinelli, "Uno sconosciuto incunabolo di Terenzio postillato dal Poliziano", *Rinascimento*, 25 (1985), 239-46. Unfortunately most of Poliziano's notes in this edition are no longer legible.

¹³ R. Ribuoli, "Per la storia del codice Bembo di Terenzio", *Rivista filologica di istruzione classica*, 109 (1981), 163-77.

the margin of fol. 34 (containing *Heaut.* 176-99 and 200-24), was suggested by Anthony Grafton on the basis of a section in the very dialogue of Bembo's which is our concern here. Hermolaus quotes Virg., *Aen.* IX 481 and says that this appeared in a scholion in the margin of his (i.e. Bembo's) Terence manuscript next to *Heaut.* 290ff. But in the codex as we now have it most of the outer margin of fol. 34 has been lost and along with it the scholion which is reported in the dialogue¹⁴. It would not be surprising if pages of Vat. lat. 3226 which had ragged edges at the time of Poliziano's collation suffered further damage. The larger question, however, of whether the Bembinus contained more folios or scraps of folios then than at present is more difficult to answer.

The first piece of the text of Terence in the Bembinus appears on the narrow inner strips of two folios containing the beginnings or ends of *An.* 787-877, but the first substantial piece of text is to be found on the lower part of a folio which was originally the third folio of the third quinion. Before the loss of the upper half the folio contained *An.* 878-902 on the recto and 903-24 on the verso. Poliziano's first notes on the Bembinus in his Terence edition actually appear just at this point. Alongside *An.* 890 we find the comment "hic fragmentata et dimidiata pagina". Moreover, Poliziano notes the loss of the folio which contained *Hec.* 1-37 (still missing) and writes the words "deest reliquum in codice antico" at *Ad.* 914, where the text apart from a few letters preserved on three scraps now ends. All this is consistent with the view that the codex was in much the same condition when Poliziano collated it as it is now. Further support for this can be drawn from the words "continet liber iste cart. cxiii" which appear on fol. V^r of the prefatory pages and which were written by Bernardo Bembo. The number agrees with what we now have, if the fragments of the two folios containing parts of *An.* 787-878 and the even smaller fragments of three folios at the end of the manuscript are excluded from the count.

On the opposing side, however, there are two pieces of evidence. The first, already mentioned, has been known for many years. *An.* 346-8 are quoted in Bembo's dialogue as if they are present in the Terence manuscript. Franz Umpfenbach accepted this evidence at face value and thought that the second quinion (where these lines would have appeared) still survived when the manuscript was in Pietro Bembo's

¹⁴ Anthony Grafton, "Pietro Bembo and the 'scholia Bemбина'", *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, 24 (1981), 405-7.

possession¹⁵. Edmund Hauler, Karl Dziatzko, and Sesto Prete all rejected the evidence of the dialogue and imputed the citation of the passage in the dialogue to carelessness on the part of Bembo¹⁶. The second piece of evidence surfaced much more recently with the discovery of Poliziano's incomplete *Miscellaneorum centuria secunda*¹⁷. In ch. 43 he reports that the Bembinus, along with the Terence manuscripts which we now know as C (Vat. lat. 3868) and D (Florence, Bibl. Med. Laur. 38.24) and another manuscript, read "symbolam" at *An.* 88 against "symbolum", the reading which he says is found "in Andriae Terentianae vulgatissimis exemplaribus". Here, then, is apparently another indication that in the late fifteenth century there were pages or fragments of pages containing some at least of the text of the earlier part of the *Andria* in the manuscript. It is difficult to disagree with Ribuoli when he says: "Appare ... poco verisimile che tanto il Poliziano quanto Bembo siano caduti in errore proprio in riferimento alla parte iniziale del Terenzio Bembo" (168)¹⁸. In the end, however, Ribuoli does not come to a definite decision and concludes that if any folios from the first two quinions did survive to be seen by Pietro Bembo and Poliziano, they were fragmentary and thus were excluded along with the surviving fragments from Bernardo Bembo's count of the pages.

To my knowledge no detailed examination of the accuracy of the Terence quotations in the dialogue has been published. Yet the care with which the other passages are quoted may provide some guidance in evaluating what is said in the dialogue about *An.* 346-8¹⁹. At the same

¹⁵ "Die Scholien des codex Bembinus zum Terentius", *Hermes*, 2 (1867), p. 339; *P. Terenti comoediae* (Berlin, 1870), pp. iv-v.

¹⁶ E. Hauler, "Paläographisches, historisches und kritisches zum Bembinus des Terenz", *Wiener Studien*, 11 (1889), 268-87 (pp. 274ff.); K. Dziatzko, "Zur Geschichte der Bembo-Handschrift des Terenz", *Rheinisches Museum f. Philologie*, 46 (1891), 47-53; S. Prete, "Politian's study of a codex of the comedies of Terence", in *Civiltà dell'Umanesimo*, Atti del VI, VII, VIII Convegno internazionale del Centro di studi umanistici, (Florence, 1972), 301-6 (p. 304); id., *Il codice di Terenzio Vaticano latino 3226. Saggio critico e riproduzione del manoscritto*. Studi e Testi, 262, (Città del Vaticano, 1970), pp. 14ff.

¹⁷ A. Poliziano, *Miscellaneorum centuria secunda*, edited by V. Branca and M. Pastore Stocchi, 4 vols (Florence, 1972).

¹⁸ On Poliziano's care in citing his sources compared with his contemporaries see A. Grafton, "On the scholarship of Politian and its context", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 40 (1977), 150-88 (pp. 160-2). The corroborative force of Poliziano's citation of *An.* 88 should not be lightly discounted.

¹⁹ F. Umpfenbach, *P. Terenti Comoediae* (Berlin, 1970), p. v, points to the inaccuracy of the citation of *An.* 921 and says that "hic quoque, *ut persaepe* [my italics], ... parum accurate de lectione codicis relatum esse". But one must take into consideration the nature of the errors and balance them against the number of accurate readings reported.

time a picture of Bembo's own interests and of any proclivity to conjecture will emerge.

In the dialogue Pomponius agrees to tell Hermolaus of the good readings which he has found in an ancient manuscript of Virgil in his possession, but in return, however, Hermolaus must report on the many places where his manuscript of Terence offers a text quite different from that of the vulgate. After what is not much more than a recitation of the *Culex* by Pomponius, Hermolaus fulfils his side of the agreement and begins with a brief discussion on the authorship of the *periochae*, the ancient summaries which precede the plays. Then the information given by Hermolaus falls into two distinct sections. In the first he gives specific examples which show "singulas omnino paginas etiamnum probam illam antiquitatem redolere" (p. 315, col. 1 / c. viii^v-d. i^r). The forty-one passages quoted here to illustrate the presence of archaisms (morphological, phonological and orthographic for the most part) are short and are usually preceded or followed by a contrast between the forms in the ancient manuscript and the modern ones²⁰. The second section makes greater demands on the reader. Hermolaus quotes forty-five passages (including *An.* 346-8) some of which are considerably longer than those of the first section (e.g. *Eun.* 1-8, *Eun.* 399-402, *Eun.* 549-54, *Heaut.* 142-6, *Ad.* 259-62), although, as in the first section, some consist of only one line (e.g. *Eun.* 377, *Eun.* 1082, *Eun.* 1094, *An.* 921, *Heaut.* 716)²¹. The striking difference between the two sections is that in the second, unlike in the first, the speaker rarely assists his listener (or the reader) to discern what features of the verses quoted are peculiar to the ancient manuscript. Midway through this second section (p. 318, col. 2 / d. viii^v) Hermolaus says to Pomponius: "Haec autem quae tibi recensui, Pomponi, quantum ab iis differant quae leguntur tute facile perspicies cum tuum sumpseris librum: quamquam ut video iam perspicis". But if Pomponius knew his Terence well enough to distinguish the new readings of the ancient codex from those of the vulgate, for most of Bembo's readers a printed edition of Terence would have been indispensable. Only very occasionally are they helped by Hermolaus in this section of

²⁰ Not quite all of the examples are actually archaisms. At *Ph.* 187, for example, Hermolaus points out that the manuscript offers the interjection "st" for the vulgate reading "est".

²¹ Hermolaus also quotes another two passages (*Heaut.* 394 and *Eun.* 504-5) but not for textual points.

the dialogue, e.g. with respect to "is" for "i" at *Heaut.* 812, "ii" for "i" at *Heaut.* 737 and 831, and "puero" for "de puero" at *Hec.* 668²².

Before the individual passages are examined in detail it is necessary to be clear about what Bembo used when he was writing the dialogue. Both speakers in the dialogue claim that they are quoting from memory, but this is clearly required by the circumstances of the meeting of the two men, although it also enhances the *doctrina* of the two participants. Bembo's readers would no more have believed this astonishing demonstration of the powers of memory on the part of Pomponius and Hermolaus than they would have believed that Bembo composed the dialogue without codex or edition at hand. What did Bembo use? Although the text of his quotations diverges from the text of the codex Bembinus on a good number of occasions, we cannot argue from this that he did not have the manuscript by his side. After all it is the accuracy of the information he gives us about the manuscript which is under investigation. However, Bembo was away from Venice for more than a year from October 1502 and spent this time at a villa in Ferrarese territory which his friend Ercole Strozza had made available to him or in Ferrara itself. The dialogue is dedicated to Strozza and it seems likely that Bembo composed the dialogue while he was in this retreat, as Carlo Dionisotti suggests²³. In a letter to Strozza Bembo mentions the transportation of books²⁴ and it is possible that he took the ancient manuscript of Terence (and of Virgil) with him. On the whole, however, the possibility seems remote. The manuscript's age and value might have prompted second thoughts about transporting it. It is natural to assume that Bembo had notes on the collation of the manuscript, and indeed Ribuoli has identified a printed edition of Terence now in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana as belonging to Bembo. This is Inc. 1523, which I hereafter refer to as M, following Ribuoli. M contains notes on and corrections of the text made by Bembo himself, notes and corrections which are almost

²² It almost seems that after the first series of examples Bembo lost interest in trying to present the rest of his information in a stimulating manner. But the sheer amount of material which he chose to include would have defeated the most inventive of writers.

²³ *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 8 (Rome, 1966), p. 137.

²⁴ Bembo is writing from Strozza's villa just after his arrival (the letter is dated to 17 October 1502) and is apologizing for not having written to him at Ferrara because of a misunderstanding: "Itaque tuo vilico Ferrariam proficiscenti meisque pueris qui cum libris navicula circumvehebantur nihil ad te litterarum dedi" (*Ep. Fam.* 3.10). The context suggests that Bembo's staff were en route with books for some *other* destination, but one might infer nevertheless that Bembo had brought books with him to Strozza's villa.

identical to those in Poliziano's edition²⁵. If Bembo had this detailed record of the ancient manuscript with him in the edition, then he would not have felt the need to have the manuscript itself. Moreover, we know that Bembo had arranged for a transcription of the ancient manuscript to be made and sent to Inghirami just before he went to Strozza's villa²⁶. Bembo might have taken this opportunity to supplement or correct the annotations in his edition from this transcription or he might have had a second copy of the transcription made for himself. The circumstances in which the dialogue was written suggest, therefore, that Vat. lat. 3226 could not be readily consulted by Bembo.

Before Ribuoli's identification of the handwriting in M as Bembo's, it was natural to assume that Bembo would have used a Terence edition of his own when he was helping Poliziano in the collation of the manuscript in 1491 and that it would have made sense for the young Pietro to have a copy of the same edition as Poliziano. Bembo's mentor, we know, collated the manuscript against Banco Rari 97²⁷. Now Bembo's edition certainly comes from the same press as Poliziano's and the date in the colophon is the same in both (21 July 1475). Some pages, including the final one with the colophon, are exactly the same, but some are different. The printer has re-set these and the result is that there are some textual differences between the two editions²⁸. On the

²⁵ See Ribuoli, *La collazione*, pp. 79ff. The edition was known to F. Umpfenbach (see *Hermes* 2, (1867), p. 339) and W. Studemund (see *Neue Jahrb. für Philologie und Paedagogik*, 97 (1868), pp. 546-8).

²⁶ So a letter written to Inghirami and dated 15 September 1502 tells us: "Terentianum librum quem tibi pollicitus fueram me missurum, Petro bibliopolae, necessario tuo, ad te referendum dedi cum his litteris, ex illo perantiquo meo descriptum mehercule diligenter", P. Bembo, *Epistulae familiarium libri VI* (Venice, 1552), 3. 19.

²⁷ As he himself states in the edition: "Ego Angelus Politianus contuleram codicem hunc Terentianum cum venerandae vetustatis codice, maioribus conscripto litteris, quem mihi utendum commodavit Petrus Bembus" (fol. 66^v).

²⁸ I have not done a complete comparison of the two editions. It looks as if Bembo's edition was printed first and that Poliziano's is a later and corrected one. Bembo's edition omits *Ad.* 11-15 at the foot of fol. 50^r and Bembo has written them in. In Poliziano's edition the correct line division at lines 1-10 has been abandoned in order to squeeze in more text on the same page. The page ends with "praeteritus" (line 14). Unfortunately, the next page is missing from Poliziano's edition, but the assumption must be that the remainder of lines 14 and 15 were added at the top of the next page. On the basis of this it would seem that Poliziano's is the later and corrected version. But in some of the pages which differ Poliziano's text has errors: e.g. the omission of "hoc" at *Ad.* 163; "arripere" at *Ad.* 181 against "arripere"; "SAMID" against "SAMIO" in the scene heading at *Ad.* 155; omission of "quid est" at *Ad.* 261; "SAMIO" against "SANNIO" in the scene heading at *Ad.* 265. The preface is also different in the two editions. See Cupaiuolo, *Bibliografia terenziana*, nos. 27, 28.

whole, however, as one would expect, the text of the two editions is very similar.

In these two editions the order of plays is *Andria* - *Eunuchus* - *Heautontimorumenos* - *Adelphoe* - *Phormio* - *Hecyra*, an unusual order to the modern reader but one that is found in most fifteenth-century editions (and in a not inconsiderable number of manuscripts)²⁹. Hermolaus substantially follows this order and not the order of plays in the Bembinus in the section of the dialogue in which the longer quotations are given³⁰. This suggests again that the dialogue was composed with his corrected edition at Bembo's side rather than the ancient manuscript.

If it is kept in mind that Bembo probably did not make direct use of the codex Bembinus for the dialogue but drew his quotations from a printed edition whose annotations were based primarily on a collation of the Bembinus, probably the one done by Poliziano and him some twelve years earlier, then some of the inaccuracies can be explained³¹. Bembo may certainly be faulted for failing to check the readings as reported in the dialogue before publication of the dialogue in 1530. He could even have avoided censure if he had chosen to point out those features of the passages where the Bembinus differed from the editions in circulation, without necessarily implying that other points in the passages reflected the text of the manuscript. As will be seen, however, the text of the passages is a fairly accurate blend of the text of his Terence edition as printed and of the text as corrected on the basis of the collation done with Poliziano in 1491. Bembo shares some of his errors with Poliziano, so that when Bembo is condemned, Poliziano is condemned also. Most of the errors, however, are Bembo's alone. Nevertheless in evaluating them we should remember that Poliziano did not always match the high standards he set himself. Poliziano stressed the need for full collation of the text of manuscripts. The errors as well as the good readings should be noted. On fol. 66^v of his Terence edition Poliziano wrote: "Observavi

²⁹ The order of plays does not agree with the order in the Bembinus or in the major medieval manuscripts. But it is closest to the so-called γ -group, the only difference being that the order of the last two plays, *Phormio* and *Hecyra*, is reversed.

³⁰ The only exception is that the two quotations from the *Andria* are given after those from the *Eunuchus* and not before.

³¹ Bembo naturally would have examined the manuscript on later occasions, and indeed writes in his edition (fol. 22^r): "Ubi .N. litera, ea glossa a me erit perfecta post discessum Politiani". See Ribuoli, *La collazione*, pp. 79 ff. Most of the differences (and they are comparatively few) between the editions of Bembo and Poliziano with respect to changes and corrections to the text probably resulted from such re-examinations.

autem quod consuevi, ut ad unguem exscriberem etiam quae plane mendosa videbantur”³². However, Ribuoli (ch. III) lists 769 points where Poliziano has failed to note divergences between the text of his edition and the text of the Bembinus³³.

In the accompanying table information is given about the readings which Hermolaus reports in the first part of the section of the dialogue which is devoted to Terence. He cites forty-one passages from Terence, three of which (*Ph.* 384-5, *Ph.* 357-8, and *Hec.* 640-1) include two forms of interest. In addition he refers to four further peculiarities of orthography (“futurumst” for “futurum est”, “formonsior” for “formosior”, “thensaurus” for “thesaurus”, and “finctus” for “fictus”) without actually quoting any passage in which they appear. In all, then, he cites forty-eight examples as worthy of note. The passages are given in the order in which they appear in the dialogue³⁴.

The second column indicates the forms in the Bembinus to which Hermolaus refers. In the third those examples where the dialogue reports readings which are not an accurate reflection of what is in the Bembinus are prefaced by (!), the plus sign indicating that the reported readings are indeed those found in the manuscript. In the fourth the lemma represents the text of Bembo’s edition, while what follows the lemma is the reading after his correction.

	AS QUOTED IN DIALOGUE	READING OF BEMBINUS	BEMBO’S EDITION
<i>Heaut.</i> 255	<i>seni</i> for <i>sene</i>	+ (<i>sene</i> A <i>seni</i> corr. rec.)	<i>sene</i>] <i>seni</i>
<i>Heaut.</i> 287	<i>anuis</i> for <i>anus</i>	+	<i>anus</i>] <i>anuis</i>
<i>Ad.</i> 870	<i>fructi</i> for <i>fructus</i>	+ (<i>frucfructi</i>)	<i>fructi</i>] No change
<i>Hec.</i> 735	<i>quaesti</i> for <i>quaestus</i>	+	<i>quaestus</i>] <i>quaesti</i>
<i>Hec.</i> 356	<i>tumulti</i> for <i>tumultus</i>	+	<i>tumulti</i>] No change

³² Cf. S. Rizzo, *Il lessico filologico*, pp. 177-8.

³³ Ribuoli includes a large number of instances where Poliziano has failed to note minor orthographic differences between the printed edition and the Bembinus.

³⁴ One problem in assessing the accuracy of the quotations lies in deciding whether deviations between the text in the dialogue and the text of the Bembinus are to be imputed to Bembo’s faulty reporting or to typographical errors. Some of the information in the table does not agree with the text of the 1729 edition, which contains a number of errors, as comparison with the 1530 edition and with two other editions — 1532 (Lyon) and 1567 (Basel) — shows. In the 1729 edition, for example, *Ad.* 870 is quoted with the form “fructui”, but the three other editions offer “fructi”. Other errors in the 1729 edition include “tumultui” at *Hec.* 365 (for “tumulti”), “istorum” at *Ph.* 741 (for “istorsum”), the omission of “ut” at *Ph.* 904, and “quid tu timeas” at *An.* 347 (for “et quid tu scio”). Some others will be referred to in the discussion of individual passages.

Ph. 154	<i>adventi</i> for <i>adventus</i>	+	<i>adventus</i>] <i>adventi</i>
Eun. 1032-3	<i>qui</i> for <i>cui</i>	+ (<i>qua</i> A ¹ <i>qui</i> Iov.)	<i>cui</i>] <i>qui</i>
Ph. 504	<i>qui</i> for <i>cui</i>	+	<i>cui</i>] <i>qui</i>
Hec. 610	<i>fuat</i> for <i>sit</i>	+ (<i>fuat</i> A ¹ <i>fiet</i> Iov.)	<i>fiat</i>] <i>fuat</i>
Ph. 345	<i>praebet</i> for <i>praebet</i>	(!) <i>praebet</i>	<i>praebet</i>] <i>praebet</i>
Ph. 500	<i>ductis</i> for <i>ductes</i>	+	<i>ductes</i>] <i>ductis</i>
Ph. 384-5	<i>enicas</i> for <i>enecas</i>	+	<i>enecas</i>] <i>enicas</i>
	<i>tacis</i> for <i>taces</i>	+	<i>taces</i>] <i>tacis</i>
Ph. 856-7	<i>enicas</i> for <i>enecas</i>	+	<i>enecas</i>] <i>enicas</i>
Ph. 994	<i>enica</i> for <i>eneca</i>	+	<i>eneca</i>] <i>enica</i>
Ph. 850	<i>restitis</i> for <i>restitas</i>	+	<i>restitis</i>] <i>restitis</i>
Ad. 63	<i>indulgis</i> for <i>indulges</i>	+	<i>indulges</i>] <i>indulgis</i>
Ad. 612	<i>obstupuit</i> for <i>obstupuit</i>	+	<i>obstupuit</i>] <i>obstupuit</i>
Heaut. 403	<i>intuitur</i> for <i>intuetur</i>	+	<i>intuetur</i>] <i>intuitur</i>
Heaut. 410	<i>luciscit</i> for <i>lucescit</i>	+	<i>lucescit</i>] <i>luciscit</i>
Ad. 227	<i>inciperunt</i> for <i>inceperunt</i>	+	<i>inceperunt</i>] <i>incip-</i>
Ad. 370	<i>dimedium</i> for <i>dimidium</i>	(!) <i>dimidium</i>	<i>dimidium</i>] <i>dimed-</i> in margin
Eun. 627	<i>demet</i> for <i>demit</i>	+	<i>demit</i>] <i>demet</i>
Ph. 357-8	<i>relicta</i> for <i>relicta est</i>	+	<i>relicta est</i>] <i>relicta</i>
	<i>neclegitur</i> for <i>negligitur</i>	+	<i>negligitur</i>] <i>neclegitur</i>
Ph. 365-6	<i>neclegere</i> for <i>negligere</i>	+	<i>negligere</i>] <i>neclegere</i>
(Ph. 812)	<i>futurum</i> for <i>est</i>	+	<i>futurum est</i>] <i>futurum</i>
Ph. 743	<i>st</i> for <i>est</i> (743)	+	<i>est</i>] <i>st</i>
Ph. 91-2	<i>illi</i> for <i>illic</i>	+ (<i>illi</i> A ¹ <i>illic</i> corr.)	<i>illic</i>] <i>illi</i>
Hec. 802-3	<i>illi</i> for <i>illic</i>	+	<i>illic</i>] <i>illi</i>
Hec. 172	<i>horunc</i> for <i>horum</i>	+ (<i>horunce</i>)	<i>horum</i>] <i>horunc</i>
Ph. 903-4	<i>quantaquanta</i> for <i>quantacumque</i>	+	<i>quantacumque</i>] <i>quanta-</i> <i>quanta</i>
Ph. 732	<i>nam quae</i> for <i>quaenam</i>	+	<i>quaenam</i>] <i>nam quae</i>
An. 939	<i>multimodis</i> for <i>multimodis</i>	+	<i>multimodis</i>] <i>multi-</i> <i>modis</i>
Eun. 826	<i>adductus</i> for <i>adductus</i> <i>est</i>	+	<i>adductus est</i>] <i>adductus</i>
Eun. 318	<i>sedecim</i> for <i>sexdecim</i>	+	<i>sexdecim</i>] <i>sedecim</i>
Eun. 693	<i>sedecim</i> for <i>sexdecim</i>	+	<i>sexdecim</i>] <i>sedecim</i>
Hec. 640-1	<i>praegnas</i> for <i>-gnans</i>	+	<i>pregnas</i>] <i>pregnas</i>
	<i>praegnatem</i> for <i>-gnantem</i>	+	<i>pregnantem</i>] <i>pregnatem</i>
Ad. 684	<i>indiliges</i> for <i>-ens</i>	+	<i>indulgens</i>] <i>indiliges</i>
An. 946	<i>miliens</i> for <i>milies</i>	+	<i>milies</i>] <i>miliens</i>
Ph. 487	<i>miliens</i> for <i>milies</i>	+	<i>milies</i>] <i>miliens</i>
Heaut. 881	<i>centiens</i> for <i>centies</i>	+	<i>centies</i>] <i>centiens</i>
An. 967-8	<i>nactus</i> for <i>nactus</i>	+	<i>nactus</i>] <i>nactus</i>
(Eun. 730)	<i>formonsior</i> for <i>-mosior</i>	+	<i>formosior</i>] <i>formonsior</i>
(Eun. 104)	<i>finctum</i> for <i>fictum</i>	+	<i>fictum</i>] <i>finctum</i>
(Eun. 10, 12)	<i>thensaurus</i> for <i>thes-</i>	+	<i>thes-</i> (bis)] <i>thens-</i> (bis)
Eun. 265	<i>ossum</i> for <i>otium</i>	+ (?)	<i>otium</i>] <i>ossum</i>

It will be seen then that Hermolaus (or rather Bembo) erred in two of the forty-eight readings which he cites³⁵. Since in this section Bembo is confining himself to specific and individual words and not, as in the second, to one or more unidentified features in generally longer extracts from the text, even two may be enough to cast doubts on Bembo's reliability. One of these, however, is shared with Poliziano and neither he nor Bembo can really be faulted. Although the Bembinus actually offers "praebe" at *Ph.* 345, the second "E" could easily be read as "I". The middle horizontal is hard to detect, but the telltale indications that the letter is "I" and not "E" are the fairly distinct upper and lower horizontals. The vertical of the letter "I" usually ends with a slight curving to the right, as can be seen, for example, in "taxis" of *Ph.* 385³⁶. To Bembo's credit he does quote *Ph.* 91 with the archaic and correct form "illi" for "illic", in agreement with the Bembinus. Poliziano fails to make this correction in his edition³⁷.

We are left with one quite blatant error: "dimedium" for "dimidium" at *Ad.* 370. No record of such a reading is to be found in Poliziano's edition, and Bembo's error seems inexplicable. The reading of the Bembinus is quite clearly "dimidium". Before acquiring a microfilm of Bembo's edition from the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, I wondered whether Bembo had confused this occurrence of the word with its only other occurrence in Terence (*Ph.* 594) or whether he had misunderstood an annotation in his edition which was based on a reading which he had found in a different manuscript. The arrival of the microfilm solved the problem. When Bembo corrected a letter in a word he often simply placed a dot under the offending letter and wrote in the correct one

³⁵ I do not count as an error the change of "horum" to "horunc" at *Hec.* 172, where the Bembinus read "horunc", any more than the failure to note that the ancient manuscript actually reads "fructu" at *Ad.* 870 (Neither Bembo nor Poliziano records either error in their editions). At *Ph.* 358 and *Ph.* 366 in the 1729 edition the readings are "neglegitur" and "neglegere" respectively, but the forms "neclegitur" and "neclegere" appear in the 1530 and the 1532 editions. Similarly, in the 1729 edition *Ph.* 403 is quoted with the form "adolescens", where the Bembinus offers "adulescens", but in the 1530 and 1532 editions the line is printed with "adulescens".

³⁶ Ribuoli does not include (*La collazione*, p. 41) the change of "praebe" to "praebit" as an error on the part of Poliziano. This may have been a slip on his part or he himself may have read the Bembinus in the same way as Poliziano.

³⁷ This error of Poliziano is also not noted by Ribuoli (see p. 40).

Bembo alters the *notae* at *Ad.* 289-90 to bring the edition into line with the Bembinus. Poliziano fails to make this change. In two other examples where Poliziano did not note the reading of the Bembinus Bembo presents the correct reading: at *Heaut.* 831 ("accipis") and *Heaut.* 163 ("crede hoc"). In both cases, however, Bembo's edition diverges from Poliziano's in offering the same reading as the Bembinus.

above. Sometimes in addition he added an insert sign (similar to an inverted "v") below the word at the point where the new letter was to appear. *Ad.* 370 is to be found on fol. 56^r. Bembo has corrected "annumeravit" in 369 to "adnumeravit". He has placed a dot under the first "n" of the word and written the letter "d" above it. He has also written an insert sign underneath the word just to the right of the first "n". This insert sign is placed immediately above the second "i" of "dimidium". However, the sign is more like a capital gamma, slightly tilted to the right, than an inverted "v" and could be read as "e". And this is what Bembo has done, for in the margin of the page he has written "Dimedium". His error then has arisen from a misunderstanding of his annotation. It is reasonable to suppose that the misunderstanding occurred some time after the passage was collated and that Bembo made an error which he would not have done if the collation had been fresh in his mind.

On the whole, therefore, Bembo comes, so far, out of the first section with considerable credit. He has two errors: one of these he shares with Poliziano; the other has arisen from an understandable misinterpretation of his annotation. But before we can form a final judgment on this section it is necessary to examine how all aspects of the text of the passages he cites in this first section stand up to comparison with the Bembinus. I give first a list of those quotations from the dialogue in which Bembo has departed from the text of his printed edition in order that the quotations may agree with the Bembinus in features other than the form which is the ostensible reason for the quotation. In the list the form which is the reason for the citation of the passage is in italics. Each quotation is followed by the text of the 1475 edition before Bembo's corrections. The additional places where the text of the printed edition (again *before* Bembo's corrections) varies from Bembo's citation have been italicized. I do not include those passages where the only difference between the text of the printed edition and Bembo's text concerns the form or forms identified in the dialogue: *Hec.* 356; *Hec.* 610; *Ph.* 345; *Ph.* 994; *Ph.* 850; *Ad.* 612; *Heaut.* 403; *Eun.* 627; *Ph.* 366; *Ph.* 91; *Hec.* 802; *Ad.* 370; *Ad.* 684; *An.* 946; *Eun.* 265³⁸.

³⁸ Although Bembo cites *Eun.* 265 for the reading "ossum" for "otium", it is not certain that this is the form of the word which was actually in the manuscript. Poliziano writes in his edition: "Est obsoletus liber ita ut non plene 'otium', neque plene 'ossum' legi possit, sed huc potius inclinatur coniectura". See Ribuoli, *La collazione*, pp. 24-5.

Agreements between the citations in the dialogue and the text of Bembo's corrected edition on other points

- An.* 939 ne istam tuam *multimodis* inveniri gaudeo
 sane istam tuam multis modis inveniri gaudeo
- An.* 967-8 more hominum evenit ut quod sim *nanctus* mali
 prius rescisceres quam ego illud quod mihi evenit boni
 968 prius rescisceres *tu* quam
- Eun.* 318 ... anni? CHR. anni? *sedecim*
 ... anni? CHR. *sexdecim*
- Eun.* 826 quid is obsecro ad nos quamobrem *adductus*?
 quid is obsecro ad *vos aut* quamobrem adductus est
- Eun.* 1032-3 nam in me plane di potestatem suam
 omnem ostendere *qui* tam subito tot congruerint commoda
 1033 cui tam subito tot *contigere bona*
- Heaut.* 255 quid *seni* erit nostro miserius?
 quid sene *nostro erit* miserius
- Heaut.* 287 eius *anuis* causa³⁹ opinor quae erat mortua
 eius anus causa *ut* opinor quae *tum* erat mortua
- Heaut.* 410 *luciscit*: hoc iam cur cesso pultare ostium
 lucescit hoc *cur iam* cesso *pulsare hostium*
- Heaut.* 881 ut nihil credas intelligere, nisi idem dictumst *centiens*
 ut nihil credas intelligere nisi idem *dictum sit* centies
- Ph.* 154 ubi in mentem eius *adventi* venit
 ubi in mentem *meam* eius adventus venit
- Ph.* 357-8 quia egens *relictast* misera, ignoratur parens,
 neclegitur ipsa. vide avaritia quid facit.
 358 ... *avaritia vide* quid facit
- Ph.* 487 at enim taedet etiam audire eadem *miliens*
 at enim taedet *iam* audire eadem milies
- Ph.* 500 ut me phaleratis ducas dictis, et meam *ductis* gratis
 ut faleratis ductis *seducas me* et meam ductes gratis
- Ph.* 504 o fortunatissime Antipho. AN. egone? PH. *qui*
 quod amas, domist
 ... cui quod amas *domi est*
- Ph.* 732 *nam quae* haec anus est, exanimata a fratre quae
 egressast meo?
 quaenam *est haec anus* exanimata a fratre quae *egressa est modo*
- Ph.* 740-3 di obsecro vos, estne hic Stilpho? CHR. non. SOPH.
 negas?

³⁹ The 1729 edition reads "caussa", but "causa" is the form in the 1530, 1532 and 1557 editions.

- CHR. concede hinc a foribus paululum istorsum sodes
 Sophrona,
 ne me istoc posthac nomine appellassis. SOPH. quid? non
 obsecro is,
 quem semper te esse dictitasti? CHR. *st.* SOPH. quid has
 metuis fores?
742 appellasses ... 743 dixti
- Ph. 856-7 satine etiam, si te dilibutum gaudio reddo? ANT. *enicas.*
 quin tu has pollicitationes auferis?
satine est si te dilibutum gaudio reddo? ANT. enicas.
 quin tu hinc pollicitationes *aufer*?
- Ph. 903-4 heus *quanta quanta* haec mea paupertas est, tamen
 adhuc curavit unum hoc quidem ut mihi esset fides
 903 heus quantacumque *est* haec mea paupertas tamen
- Hec. 172 *horunc* ea ad de lege redibat haereditas
horum ad hos redibat per legem haereditas
- Hec. 640-1 nam abducta a nobis *praegnas* fuerat filia.
 nec fuisse *praegnatem* ante hunc umquam scivi diem
 nam *abducta nobis* praegnas fuerat filia.
 nec fuisse praegnatem *umquam ante hunc* scivi diem
- Hec. 735 ne nomen *quaesti* mihi obstet: nam mores facile tueor
 ne nomen quaestus mihi obstet *apud te.* nam mores facile *tutor*
- Ad. 63 vestitu nimio *indulgis*
 vestitu *nimum* indulges
- Ad. 227 peri hercle: hac illi spe hoc *inciperunt*
perii hercle hac illi spe hoc inceperunt
- Ad. 870 nunc exacta aetate hoc *fructi* pro labore ab iis⁴⁰ fero
 nunc exacta aetate hoc fructi pro labore *his* fero

In these passages Bembo has silently departed from the text of his edition to bring his quotations into accord with the reading of the Bembinus, in addition to the specific points which he is illustrating. In so doing he has introduced a further thirty-nine changes from the text of his printed edition.

However, he has not been completely accurate. Four readings which do not reflect the text of the Bembinus almost certainly go back to errors and omission made in the collation of the manuscript with Poliziano, since the deviations from the Bembinus are also to be found in Poliziano's printed edition. These occur at *An.* 939, where the

⁴⁰ Poliziano corrects "his" to "is". Bembo here is more accurate.

Bembinus reads "multimodis tuam" and "invenire"; at *Heaut.* 410, where "cur" is omitted from the Bembinus and both Bembo and Poliziano correct "cur iam" of their editions to "iam cur"; and at *Hec.* 735 where the word order in the ancient manuscript is "mihi quaesti". In one case Poliziano has corrected his edition, where Bembo has not: at *Hec.* 641 Bembo has not changed "nec" of his edition to "neque" of the Bembinus and "nec" is the form which appears in the dialogue. At *Ph.* 742 Bembo offers "obsecro is" at the end of the line. The editions of both Bembo and Poliziano read "obsecro is est", which Poliziano has changed correctly to "obsecro es". In Bembo's edition the first letter of "is" has been altered, and the alteration could be read as "e" or "i". I suspect that Bembo misinterpreted the alteration when he was composing the dialogue. The other errors are of a trivial kind. In six instances we find forms which Bembo had actually corrected in his edition, but for some reason the uncorrected forms appear in the dialogue: *An.* 967 "quod" (for "quid"); 968 "illud" (for "illut"); *Eun.* 693 "at" (for "ad"); *Heaut.* 881 "intelligere" (for "intellegere"); *Ph.* 304 "consobrinum" (for "sobrinum"); *Hec.* 640 "nobis" (for "vobis").

There remain four readings which are not to be found either in the Bembinus or in Bembo's edition: "maxume" for "maxime" at *Ph.* 384; "etiam" for "est" at *Ph.* 856; "has" for "hinc" at *Ph.* 857; and "mihi" for "tibi" at *An.* 968⁴¹. The first of these is trivial, the second may have arisen from the misreading of an abbreviation in holograph, the third could have been caused by the influence of the following word ("pollicitationes") and was probably a slip of Bembo or the printer. The other is more difficult to explain. Possibly the close proximity of the first person pronoun ("quam *ego* illud quod mihi evenit boni") prompted the substitution of "mihi" for "tibi".

As might be expected, then, the quotations as a whole do not reflect with complete accuracy the text of the Bembinus⁴². But the inaccuracies are not of such a kind to lend credence to any assumption that Bembo has deliberately and wilfully introduced conjectures of his own. Some of

⁴¹ Bembo actually cites *An.* 967-8 as if the lines were from the *Eunuchus*: "sed est etiam in Eunuchus". The form "nactus", the reason for the citation, is actually found in the Bembinus at *Eun.* 556. If Bembo did not make a slip, it is possible that he quoted both *Eun.* 556 and *An.* 967 and that the former was omitted by the printer. The same mistake is found in the other three editions.

⁴² One might compare how when the ancient grammarians quote passages to exemplify interesting grammatical forms they often misquote the immediate context of the word in which they are interested.

the errors he shares with Poliziano, most of them are errors of omission where corrections in his printed edition have not been carried over into the citations in the dialogue. The most interesting and potentially most valuable for our purpose are those readings which differ from both the codex Bembinus and the text of his printed edition (before and after his own corrections). If we can find such readings in other manuscripts or printed editions, we can deduce that Bembo's sources for the dialogue were not confined to the printed edition in which he had recorded the readings of the ancient manuscript. In that case Bembo's citation of *An.* 346-8 may also have come from such a source.

It is necessary, therefore, to look at the second part of Hermolaus's exposition on the value of his ancient manuscript and to search for more readings of this kind in the second group of quotations. But in order to evaluate their significance in terms of quantity and quality we should balance these against the readings which accurately reflect the text of the Bembinus against the printed text of Bembo's 1475 edition. Information on the latter is given in the following list.

	READING IN QUOTATION	READING OF BEMBO'S EDITION
<i>Eun.</i> 1-8	placere studeat existimavit existimet quia laesit prior et easdem scribendo	placere se studeat existimat existimet sciat praesumat quale sit prius et eas describendo
<i>Eun.</i> 220-1	ingratis abi sis	ingratus ah
<i>Eun.</i> 331-2	sex septem	sex vel septem
<i>Eun.</i> 347-8	ipsast ilicet	ipsa est scilicet
<i>Eun.</i> 377	nunciam orna abduc duc potest	nunciam oro orna adhuc duc <i>om.</i> potes
<i>Eun.</i> 384-5	despectam	despicatam
<i>Eun.</i> 399-403	magno gestare vero exercitum consilia	magnam gestire verum exercitum et consilia
<i>Eun.</i> 529-30	molesta ne quod ecquis hic est	ne molesta quid PY. quis hic est

	READING IN QUOTATION	READING OF BEMBO'S EDITION
<i>Eun.</i> 545-6	idque adeo domist quisnam hinc is est an non hominis qui hic ornatus	ibo ad eum domi est sed quisnam hic ipse est an non hominis est quid hic ornatus
<i>Eun.</i> 549-54	nuncquis (<i>bis</i>) homost est profecto vita quoque eam enicet nunc mihi	numquis (<i>bis</i>) homo est est tempus profecto vitam quique iam enecet nunc mihi video
<i>Eun.</i> 639-40	amare haud nihil	amare autem nihil
<i>Eun.</i> 811-12	(TH.) quid nunc agimus? GN. qu. ... quid (<i>alterum</i>)	GN. quid nunc agimus? qu. ... quin
<i>Eun.</i> 1000-1	aliquid faceret iis	faceret aliquid is
<i>Eun.</i> 1056-7	conlibitum feceris donum praemium a me	tibi collibuit est facile effeceris donum a me et primum
<i>Eun.</i> 1082	homo	hominem
<i>Eun.</i> 1094	praeter promissum est ite hac	praetermissum est <i>om.</i> GN. ite hac
<i>An.</i> 921	istuc tuum malum feras	istaec malum <i>post</i> feres feres
<i>Heaut.</i> 115-16	me aetate sapientia	me et aetate benevolentia
<i>Heaut.</i> 142-6	excercent aedis mercedem ad quindecim	exerceant aedes mercede quindecim
<i>Heaut.</i> 149	nec mihi fas ulla me his	nec fas me ulla hic
<i>Heaut.</i> 203-6	huncchine uniusmodi nolunt nolunt convivari	huccine huiusmodi non vult convivari
<i>Heaut.</i> 627-8	sic est factum CHR. domin? SYR. ...	ita factum est SYR. si sic est factum domina ...
<i>Heaut.</i> 716	me aetatem censes adsimularier	me tandem censes assimularier

	READING IN QUOTATION	READING OF BEMBO'S EDITION
<i>Heaut.</i> 812-13	mihi res is hinc	mihi res <i>om.</i> i tu hinc
<i>Heaut.</i> 737	istam quaeso ii	istam nunc quaeso abi
<i>Heaut.</i> 831-2	ii	hei
<i>Heaut.</i> 1006-7	pergin mulier odiosa esse fueris adversatrix	oh pergin mulier esse adversatrix fueris
<i>Heaut.</i> 1014	subditum (<i>bis</i>) certe sic erit confitere tu au inimicis	subductum (<i>bis</i>) certe inquam confitere tuum non esse ah nostris inimicis
<i>Ad.</i> 126	tun consiliis	tune consulis
<i>Ad.</i> 162-3	huius	hodie
<i>Ad.</i> 185	egon debacchatus sum autem an tu in me mitte istaec	egone autem debacchatus sum in te aut tu in me omitte ista
<i>Ad.</i> 259-62	homini nemini ellum Syre nunc vivo festivum caput post putarit esse prae	omnium neminem iamdudum nunc vivo Syre o festivum caput postponenda putarit esse <i>om.</i> pro
<i>Ad.</i> 288-90	CA. quid fiat ... pepereris fiat rogas num (290) adfueris	CA. quid ... SO. modo ... CA. iam ... pepereris fiet rogas nunc affueris
<i>Ad.</i> 566-7	servolum referire	servulum referre
<i>Ad.</i> 594-6	nisi si fecere ipsi expostules	nisi facere ipsi <i>om.</i> expostulant
<i>Ph.</i> 181a-2	182 <i>post</i> 181a diutius audacia	181a <i>post</i> 182 diutius iam audacia
<i>Ph.</i> 844	ego nunc mihi onero	ego <i>om.</i> mihi nunc exhonorero

	READING IN QUOTATION	READING OF BEMBO'S EDITION
<i>Ph.</i> 851-3	minitatur ipsus est (GE.) congregere actutum o omnium vivunt homo hominum	minatur ipse est PH. congregere actutum omnium vivant hominum 'homo
<i>Ph.</i> 989	exculpe probe	exclude locus
<i>Hec.</i> 138-9	virgine una cubuerit adolescens cubuerit potus sese	virgine ista una concubuerit concub. adolescens potis se
<i>Hec.</i> 274	non sumus inique omnino omnes	nos sumus mulieres inique <i>om.</i> omnes
<i>Hec.</i> 286-7	nam nos omnes labos rescitumst lucrost	nam omnibus nobis labor rescitum est lucro est
<i>Hec.</i> 459-61	relinquunt (relinquont <i>A</i>)	reliquit
<i>Hec.</i> 664-8	vosmet remissan opus sit puero reducta	vosme remissa sit opus de puero reductam

From the number of these examples and the quality of many of the readings it is not hard to imagine the effect that the Bembinus must have had on Poliziano when he collated it in 1491. It is true that in his time most manuscripts of Terence would have differed significantly from the text of any printed edition, but none could have offered the same richness as the codex Bembinus. For his part Bembo chose his examples well to display in the dialogue the richness of the manuscript; in just under one hundred lines of text there are approximately one hundred and fifty places where the ancient manuscript differs from Bembo's base text⁴³. The differences embrace not only the usual kind of variants,

⁴³ The exact number depends on how some of the examples are counted, as one or more.

I have included in the above list "istuc" at *An.* 921, although it is impossible, because of the state of the page at this point, to be certain whether the Bembinus read "istuc", as Bembo quotes the line, or "istaec" the reading of his printed edition, left uncorrected. I am

involving the addition or loss of words, variation in the order of words or lines, and orthographic idiosyncrasies, but also the assigning of parts (e.g. *Ph.* 851-3, *Ad.* 288-90, *Heaut.* 627-8, *Eun.* 811-12, *Eun.* 529-30, *Eun.* 1094).

I count over fifty instances where Bembo's citations differ from the Bembinus, but just over half of these are minor orthographic differences (e.g. "festivum" for "festivom" at *Ad.* 289, "aedepol" for "edepol" at *Hec.* 272, "haud" for "haut" at *Hec.* 459), and in almost every case they reflect the readings of the printed edition⁴⁴. The same is true for more striking errors. Bembo quotes *Eun.* 811 with the word order "iam haec tibi" against "haec tibi iam" of the Bembinus, but the word order is the same as in the edition, and was not corrected by either Bembo or Poliziano⁴⁵. But what we are looking for are readings in the dialogue which are in neither the Bembinus nor in the printed edition, before or after Bembo's corrections. In the list which follows the lemma expresses the agreement of the Bembinus and the printed edition and is followed by the reading offered by Bembo (= B) in the dialogue.

<i>Eun.</i> 400	transmovet] transfert
<i>Eun.</i> 550	licet mihi] mihi licet
<i>Eun.</i> 1082	prorsus] <i>om. B</i>
<i>An.</i> 921	moneo] moveo
<i>An.</i> 921	non] num
<i>Heaut.</i> 143	sumptum] victum
<i>Heaut.</i> 204	insimulat] insimulant
<i>Heaut.</i> 205	paullo ... tolerabilis] <i>om. B</i>
<i>Heaut.</i> 812	huius modi] modi <i>om. B</i>
<i>Heaut.</i> 1007	in ea re] re <i>om. B</i>
<i>Heaut.</i> 1015	obsecro te] te <i>om. B</i>
<i>Ph.</i> 181a	non astu] astu non
<i>Ph.</i> 852	quid est] est <i>om. B</i>
<i>Hec.</i> 666	versum <i>om. B</i>

To these we may add the four readings of this nature from the first section:

inclined to think that the space between the "G" of "ego" and the next letter which can be read (the "C" of the pronoun) suits "istuc" rather than "istaec".

⁴⁴ Most of these, however, have been corrected by Bembo in his edition.

⁴⁵ So too "neminem" at *Eun.* 553 and "adiuvant" at *Hec.* 459 (against "neminemne" and "iuvant" of the Bembinus) were not corrected by Bembo and Poliziano and the verses appear with these forms in the dialogue.

<i>Ph.</i> 385	maxime] maxume
<i>Ph.</i> 856	est] etiam
<i>Ph.</i> 857	hinc] has
<i>An.</i> 968	tibi] mihi

Most of these aberrations can be explained as errors made by Bembo himself or by the printer. Five involve the omission of a single word, while in two there is a simple transposition of two words. In another two (*Heaut.* 205 and *Hec.* 666) the omissions are more extensive. In the former of these the words omitted (“paullo ... tolerabilis”) occupy a complete line in Bembo’s edition. Even “moveo”, the correct reading for “moneo” of the Bembinus and Bembo’s edition, may have resulted from a fortuitous mistake on the part of the printer⁴⁶. The same explanation may hold for “num” instead of “non” at *An.* 921 and for “etiam” instead of “est” at *Ph.* 856⁴⁷.

Two of the readings in the above list, however, are more difficult to explain if M was the sole source for Bembo in the composition of the dialogue: “transfert” for “transmovet” at *Eun.* 400 and “victum” for “sumptum” at *Heaut.* 143. Both look as if they might be originally medieval glosses which could have intruded into the text of a manuscript and replaced the words which they explained. And in fact in several manuscripts “transfert” can be found as a gloss on “transmovet”⁴⁸. It made its way into the text of at least one printed edition. It is found, for example, in a 1479 edition prepared by F. Diana and printed in Venice⁴⁹. The text of this edition is actually very similar to that of the editions used by Poliziano and Bembo. However, Diana’s edition has none of the other *lectiones singulares* in the above list. I have been unable to find “victum” either in a Terence manuscript as a gloss or in

⁴⁶ We can not discount the possibility, however, that Bembo deliberately departed from the reading of his edition because he knew the reading “moveo” from other editions (both “moneo” and “moveo” are found in fifteenth-century editions).

⁴⁷ Bembo could have referred the printer to a marked printed edition of Terence when quotations of Terence were to be inserted, but this would have been a cumbersome procedure. I think it more likely that Bembo wrote out or had someone write out a fair copy when the work went to press.

The reading “num” at *An.* 921 is also to be found in some editions and in at least two instances “num” appears alongside “moveo” and not “moneo” (in editions *c* and *g*: see below, p. 239).

⁴⁸ It appears, for example, in Vat. lat. 3868 (= C); Florence, Med. Laur. 38.24 (= D); Oxford, Bodl. Auct. F.6.27; Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 7903, 16235. See F. Schlee, *Scholia terentiana* (Leipzig, 1893), p. 102.

⁴⁹ See Cupaiuolo, *Bibliografia terenziana*, no. 44.

the text of a printed edition. Possible explanations for the presence of these two strange readings are:

- (a) that Bembo and / or the printer subconsciously replaced the two words with near synonyms;
- (b) that "transfert" and "victum" are emendations of Bembo;
- (c) a combination of (a) and (b);
- (d) Bembo used, in addition to M, a printed edition in which "transfert" and "victum" were either in the text or had been written in above "transmovet" and "sumptum" respectively⁵⁰.

We shall see that Bembo must have had some source other than M, but the existence of this additional source does not preclude the possibility that "transfert" and "victum" are actually emendations of Bembo⁵¹.

If we cannot be certain that "transfert" and "victum" are conjectures, no such doubt attaches to the text of *Heaut.* 627-8. These lines are quoted by Bembo in the dialogue as follows⁵²:

(CHR.) scio quid feceris:
sustulisti. SOS. sic est factum. CHR. domin? SYR. ergo herus
damno auctus est.

In the printed edition the text reads:

(CHR.) scio quid feceris:
sustulisti. SOS. ita factum est. SYR. si sic est factum, domina,
ergo herus damno auctus est.

In his edition Poliziano has corrected the text to bring it into accord with the Bembinus:

(CHR.) scio quid feceris:
sustulisti. SOS. sic est factum. SYR. domina ego erus damno
auctus est.

Poliziano has given preference to "ego" over "ergo" of the first hand of the Bembinus⁵³. As Bembo prints the verse, he expunges some of the

⁵⁰ Another possibility is that Bembo did not use M at all when he was composing the dialogue but had another edition in which the readings of the Bembinus had been recorded. This edition may have had other annotations which are not found in M. On the whole this seems unlikely.

⁵¹ That is how they are taken in the variorum edition of 1560 (Lyons, M. Bonhomme or A. Vincentius; see Cupaiuolo, no. 476).

⁵² For convenience I regularize the *notae personae* and the verse division in the following citations from the dialogue and the edition.

⁵³ In the Oxford Classical Text the correction "ego" is ascribed to Iovialis.

errors of the printed edition; he has changed "ita" to "sic" and omitted "si sic est factum". Unlike Poliziano, however, he has retained "ergo", which is in fact not corrected in his edition. But, while incorporating some of the readings of the Bembinus, he has made other changes which do not reflect the text of the ancient manuscript. He has changed "domina" to "domin" (= "domi-ne?") and given this word to Chremes instead of to Syrus, as in the printed edition and the Bembinus. There can be no doubts about the text as printed in the dialogue, since it agrees with a marginal note in Bembo's edition. This reads "Ch. Domin? SY. Ergo" and is prefaced by a *signe de renvoi* which appears in the text above "domina ergo" (a line has been drawn through both these words in the edition). It seems, however, that this is a change which Bembo made some time after the collation of the Bembinus with Poliziano, since a word which has been inserted above and between "factum" and "domina" and which, if Bembo's corrections were to be in line with Poliziano's, should indicate a change of speaker has been stroked out. Unfortunately, it is not legible on microfilm⁵⁴.

I have not encountered Bembo's suggestion in any printed editions or in the major manuscripts and it must be supposed to be a conjecture of Bembo himself. The context of this passage is that Sostrata is about to tell her husband that a daughter of theirs whom he had ordered to be exposed at birth has apparently survived. When Sostrata asks her husband: "Meministin me esse gravidam et mihi te maximo opere edicere, si puellam parerem, nolle tolli?" (626-7), Chremes anticipates what his wife is about to say ("scio quid feceris: sustulisti"). The text of the Bembinus then runs:

ⓈICESTFACTVM**B**DOMINA**E**RGO**E**RVS**D**AMNO**A**VCTVSEST

The emboldened letters are the *notae personae*, "Ⓢ" standing for Sostrata and "B" for Syrus⁵⁵. The passage as it appears in the Bembinus makes

⁵⁴ I have not found other comparable examples of such changes in a very cursory examination of parts of the printed edition. On the same page of the edition Bembo wrote by error "quid" above "si tu" in line 632. This has been scored out and written above "si peccavi" in line 631. Bembo obviously added "quid" after the wrong "si" and then made the necessary change to bring the printed edition into line with the text of the Bembinus. This change seems quite different from what Bembo has done at line 628.

⁵⁵ Almost all the other manuscripts give all these words to Syrus. Kauer-Lindsay report in the apparatus of the OCT that only L² and p¹ agree with the Bembinus. Bembo has not cited this passage, however, because of the unusual assignation of parts, since what we find in the Bembinus in this respect is close to what is found in Bembo's edition.

some sense. After Sostrata admits raising the child, the slave then makes the comment on the financial burden that has now been laid on his master. If "ergo" is read, then "domina" must be in the vocative case. But the vocative is awkward, since the comment of the slave looks like an aside. Why should Syrus address his mistress at this point? Perhaps it was unease on this point that led Bembo to emend. He has taken the final letter of "DOMINA" to reflect what was once a *nota personae*. Since in this scene "A" is the *nota* for Chremes and "B" is the *nota* for Syrus, this would mean that Syrus should ask "domin?" and Chremes should say "ergo erus damno auctus est". But these last words are obviously better given to the slave, and once that is done, "domin?" must be spoken by Chremes. The sense of the passage, as presented by Bembo, would be:

CHR. "I know what you did: you raised the child".

SOS. "That is so".

CHR. "She's in the house?"

SYR. "My master, then, has gained — expenses"!

Chremes and Syrus have already heard Sostrata tell the *nutrix* that she has recognized the ring of the girl inside the house to be the one with which her own child was exposed as a baby. Chremes then could readily surmise that the girl was indeed his daughter and was in his home at that moment.

In his emendation Bembo has stayed close to the *paradosis* and has done so rather ingeniously. If Bembo's conjecture is correct, the corruption must have arisen when the *notae* "A" and "B" which flanked "DOMIN" were exchanged. Subsequently "A" was wrongly taken to be the final letter of "DOMINA"⁵⁶. But if the emendation is neat and indeed quite clever, it is also quite definitely wrong. At the beginning of 629-30 Sostrata says "minime; sed erat hic Corinthia anus haud inpura: ei dedi exponendam". Sostrata is here responding to her husband's words at 627-8 ("scio quid feceris: sustulisti"). This shows that "sic est factum" in 628 can not be spoken by her, since these words

⁵⁶ Because of the system of marking the speakers in ancient dramatic texts, the assignation of parts is an area where modern editors are much less bound to what has been transmitted in the manuscripts. See E. T. Jory, "Algebraic notation in dramatic texts", *Bulletin* [of the London] *Institute of Classical Studies*, 10 (1963), 65-78; J. Andrieu, *Le dialogue antique* (Paris, 1954), pp. 209-57; G. Jachmann, *Die Geschichte des Terentztextes im Altertum* (Basel, 1924), pp. 82-3.

contradict "minime", and must therefore be spoken by Syrus⁵⁷. Moreover the conjecture ruins the slave's pun in the words "domina ego, erus damno auctus est" (with "ego" being read for "ergo"): "I've gained a mistress, and my master expenses"⁵⁸.

To summarize the findings of this investigation so far, it can be said that in the dialogue Bembo discloses an impressive number of readings from the Bembinus. One of his particular interests, as is shown especially in the first group of quotations, is orthographic. In this he is probably reflecting a concern of Poliziano⁵⁹. But the quotations cover almost the whole range of possible corruptions⁶⁰. We have seen, however, that the text of the quotations in the dialogue do not reflect on a number of occasions the text (after corrections) of the printed edition. Although most of the textual features involved are admittedly minor in nature, Bembo cannot escape the charge of carelessness. More serious is his report of *Heaut.* 627-8, the text of which, although in part reflecting what is in the Bembinus, definitely incorporates a conjecture. Two other possible emendations are at *Eun.* 400 and *Heaut.* 143. (It must be said that all three conjectures have no claim to consideration for adoption) Yet none of these shortcomings comes near to the charge on which Bembo must be indicted if indeed the folio of the Bembinus containing *An.* 346-8 had long been lost from the codex before he ever studied it.

Let us turn to this passage. Bembo introduces it immediately after he has given Hermolaus the following words: "ex illo libro maxima eius fabulae [i.e. *Andria*] pars desideratur, fugientibus vetustate litteris, ut cognosci nequeant. Sed percepta mihi tamen sunt atque agnita, quod meminerim, haec perpauca". These words imply that the pages containing

⁵⁷ Faernus gives everything after "sustulisti" to Syrus. He writes: "Liber Bembinus post 'sustulisti' ita notatas habet personas: 'SOS. sic est factum. SY. domina ergo erus damno auctus est'. sed haec lectio non videtur procedere, cum infra Sostrata dicat 'minime' ... omnes alii libri, et antiqui et recentes, haec omnia verba Syro attribuunt". Muret made much the same point in his *Argumentorum et annotationum in Terentium liber* (Venice, 1555), fol. 23^v.

⁵⁸ Bembo's conjecture does not contravene the metre, but only if "domin" is scanned as a pyrrhic, through "iambic shortening". Bembo certainly did not understand this process and it is therefore accidental that the emendation does not offend the metre.

⁵⁹ See Ribuoli, *La collazione*, pp. 28-9.

⁶⁰ Poliziano recognized the importance of the Bembinus for establishing the verse division of Terence's plays and carefully noted in his edition where the verses ended in the ancient manuscript. This is not an aspect of the manuscript to which the medium chosen by Bembo, the dialogue, lent itself. But the verse division of the quotations in the dialogue is fairly accurately observed.

the text of the *Andria* had survived but that most had been impossible to read. As we have seen, however, the notes in Poliziano's edition and the count of the pages given by Bernardo Bembo are consistent with the assumption that no more pages in the codex were known to them than to us⁶¹. Whatever be the truth about the remains of the *Andria* in the codex (and perhaps the truth lies somewhere between what Bembo's description implies and the present state of the manuscript), it would be extremely surprising in this context for Bembo to adduce a passage which he had never seen in the manuscript and which he must have known occurred in the first half of the play.

Does the text of these three lines help to solve the problem? Bembo quotes them as follows⁶²:

Dave perii. DA. quin tu hoc audi. PAM. interii. DA. quid timeas scio.
CH. mea quidem hercle certe in dubio vitast. DA. et quid tu scio.
PAM. nuptiae mihi. DA. et si scio. PAM. hodie. DA. obtundis.
tametsi intelligo.

Anyone familiar with modern editions may wonder why Bembo bothered to cite the lines. There is little difference between them and what we find in most current editions, both with respect to the text itself and to the verse division⁶³. The lines, however, have to be seen in the context of Bembo's own time and of how they were printed in the early editions of Terence. In Bembo's edition the passage is printed thus⁶⁴:

PAM. Dave perii. DA. quin tu *potius* hoc audi. PAM. interii.
DA. quid timeas scio. CH. mea quidem *hercle in dubio est vita*.
DA. et quid tu scio. PAM. nuptiae mihi. DA. et si *id* scio.
PAM. hodie. DA. obtundis. tametsi intelligo.

The verse division, which is completely erroneous, has been corrected by

⁶¹ Even if some fragments of some of the early pages in the codex survived (not an unlikely supposition), Bembo's words would be misleading. They suggest that the manuscript was complete but that most of the pages containing the *Andria* were illegible.

It is possible that fragments from the early part of the codex were kept separate from the codex or that they were in such bad physical condition that Poliziano and Bembo virtually ignored them when they collated the manuscript in 1491.

⁶² The first word of 346 is actually printed as "Davae" in the 1530 edition, but the obvious error has been corrected in subsequent editions.

⁶³ The only difference between Bembo's text and that of Kauer-Lindsay in the OCT relates to the assigning of some of the words. The OCT follows Donatus.

⁶⁴ I have regularized the *notae* but have retained the verse division of the lines as they appear in Bembo's edition. The text of Poliziano's edition is exactly the same except that the third line ends with "hodie" and not with "scio".

Bembo. The words italicized mark places in the text where Bembo's citation differs from what is found in his edition: he omits "potius" in 346; adds "certe" after "hercle" and reverses the word order of "est vita" in 347; and omits "id" in 348. The omission of "potius" and the addition of "certe" are required for metrical reasons (the lines are trochaic septenarii), although Bembo would not have realized this. The important point to note here is that in M the lines are left uncorrected; the page on which they appear is free of any comments or annotation⁶⁵. Bembo therefore must have drawn on another source for the revised text of these lines. Could he have seen and possessed a different edition which contained the text he presents here?

I have looked at a number of fifteenth-century editions of Terence to see whether Bembo's text of *An.* 346-8 as presented in the dialogue is closer to any of these than to the text of the 1475 edition.

- a 1469-70 Strasbourg, J. Mentelin
- b [1470] [Naples / Brescia]
- c 1471 ed. R. Zovenzonius. Venice, V. de Spira
- d 1472 Rome, Sweynheim & Pannartz
- e 1472 ed. A. Sabinus. Rome, G. Lauer
- f 1472 ed. A. Moretus. Venice
- g 1474 Padua, B. de Valdezochio
- h 1477 Treviso, H. de Levilapis
- m 1479 ed. F. Diana. Venice, N. Girardengus
- n 1490 Venice, B. de Choris et S. de Luero
- p 1496 Strasbourg, J. Grüninger
- g 1497 ed. C. Pierius. Venice, J. P. de Lueco
- r 1499 Venice, Lazarus de Soardis
- s 1499 ed. J. Curtus. Strasbourg, J. Grüninger

This is of course a tiny sample from the large number of the Terence texts which had been printed before Bembo wrote the dialogue. But Bembo himself did not have knowledge of very many of these. He concerned himself primarily with the differences between the Bembinus

⁶⁵ In fact before *An.* 888, the point where the Terence text of the Bembinus begins according to Poliziano, only a few glosses are to be found in Bembo's edition. Two of them show that Bembo went back to the scanty remains of the surviving two pages (containing *An.* 787-877) in the ancient manuscript after Poliziano had left. He has written "forte" beside "fere" (813) and "antiquorum consuetudinem" alongside "antiquom" (817), prefaced by "C.", which signifies a scholion in the Bembinus, and followed by ".N.". These can still be read in the manuscript, but there is no note on them in Poliziano's edition. The words "perparce nimium" also appear alongside *An.* 455. The reason is unclear, since that is the reading in the text of Bembo's edition.

and his own edition, which I think he believed to be very similar to others. When he quotes *Ph.* 903 (for the reading “quanta quanta”) in the dialogue, he adds the comment “non, ut in reliquis ‘quantacumque’”. Now *his* edition certainly reads “quantacumque”, as does *m*, but four editions which I examined on this point (*cefg*) all offer “quanta”, not “quantacumque”.

In line 347 all except *a* (the *editio princeps*) omit “certe” and give the word order “est vita”. None reads “et si scio” in 348, having either “et si id scio”, “et id scio”, or “et hoc scio”. At 346 eight of the editions (*fhmnpqrs*) offer “tu potius hoc” for “tu hoc”. Moreover, in those editions where the text is not printed as prose the verse division is erroneous. It does not seem likely, therefore, that a fifteenth-century edition was his source.

Because of the delay of almost twenty-seven years between the initial composition and publication of the dialogue, we cannot rule out the possibility that Bembo derived these good readings from an edition published after 1503. The edition which marks a distinct advance over the fifteenth-century vulgate is the 1505 edition of Benedictus Philologus, since some use was made of Poliziano’s notes on his collation of the codex Bembinus and a serious attempt was made to present the text with a great improvement in the verse division⁶⁶. The lines in question appear in this edition as follows:

PA. Dave perii. DA. quin tu hoc audi. PA. interii. DA. quid timeas scio.
CH. mea quidem hercle in dubio est vita. DA. et quid tu scio.
PA. nuptiae mihi. DA. et si scio. PA. hodie. DA. obtundis tametsi intellego.

This agrees with Bembo in the verse division, in the omission of “potius” in 346 and in the reading “etsi scio” in 348. In the other two features, however, Benedictus has the same text as most of the earlier editions: the omission of “certe” and the word order “est vita”.

In the first Aldine edition of Terence, published in 1517 and printed by Andreas Asolanus, we find:

⁶⁶ The title of the edition was *Terentius in sua metra restitutus* and in the prefatory letter to Petrus Crinitus acknowledgement was made of the contribution of Poliziano: “Neque te praeterit quantum etiam in hac parte manibus Angeli Politiani debeatur, qui primus (ut homo accuratissimus in pervestigandis veterum monumentis) hasce Terentii fabulas emendare aggressus est et in suos numeros aptissime referre, collatis ac perlectis vetustis exemplaribus”.

P. Dave perii. D. quin tu hoc audi. P. interii. D. quid timeas scio.
 C. mea quidem hercle in dubio vita'st. D. et tu quid timeas scio.
 P. nuptiae mihi. D. et id scio. P. hodie. D. obtundis tametsi intellego.

Here again we find agreement with Bembo on two of the four points: the omission of "potius", as in Benedictus, and "vita'st" for the usual "est vita" (Note the prodelision of "est", to which I shall return). But on two other points the Aldine stands on the side of the vulgate. In fact I have not been able to find an early sixteenth-century edition which manages to equal in quality Bembo's text in these three lines. Even Erasmus in his edition published in 1532 omits "certe" in 347, and he offers "et id scio" in 348⁶⁷.

The commentary of Donatus is a possible source. There Bembo could have found information which led him to omit "potius", to add "certe", and to read "etsi scio", recorded as a variant by Donatus, in place of "et quid tu scio". But Donatus says nothing which would have prompted Bembo to change the word order "est vita" in his edition. Moreover, Donatus' comments assume that Charinus said "interii" (346) and that Pamphilus spoke the words "mea quidem hercle ... vitast" (347), just the opposite of what we find in Bembo's quotation (and in all the surviving manuscripts and in all the early editions). That source, therefore, is unlikely.

However, a few manuscripts do have almost exactly the same text for these lines as Bembo. These are the purer members of the γ class, which, unlike the δ manuscripts, have the word order "vita est". It is possible, therefore, that Bembo drew his information from one of these. We know that Poliziano was familiar with one of the best γ manuscripts, the illustrated Terence manuscript in the Vatican library (Vat. lat. 3868 = C), since he mentions it in ch. 43 of the *Centuria secunda*⁶⁸ and refers to it in the notes on the *Andria* which he probably wrote for the 1484-5 academic year⁶⁹. But this manuscript is written as prose and Bembo could not have derived the correct verse division from it. Bembo may have received information from Poliziano about this manuscript, noted

⁶⁷ In Hugualdus's edition (Basel, 1522) the three lines are printed exactly the same as in the Aldine of 1517 (with the same error at the end of 347: "et tu quid timeas scio").

⁶⁸ See above, p. 216.

⁶⁹ Angelo Poliziano, *La commedia antica e l'Andria di Terenzio*, edited by R. L. Roselli, (Florence, 1973), pp. xi-xii. Poliziano says that the "codex Palatinus" reads "operam" at *An.* 5 but that the macron above the final "a" has been erased. This is just what we find in Vat. lat. 3868.

it in an edition and then later mistakenly thought that the notes referred to his own ancient manuscript. Another possible candidate is what is now Oxford, Brasenose College 18. According to a handwritten notice, dated to 1632, the manuscript was part of Pietro Bembo's library and was bought by Sir Henry Wotton in Venice from Bembo's heirs. This too is a γ manuscript, though less pure than C, but, unlike C, it has the correct verse division. There is no convincing evidence, however, to show that Bembo used this manuscript⁷⁰. We have to balance these possibilities against Bembo's personal knowledge of his treasured manuscript. He knew that most of the *Andria* was either lost or undecipherable. One could understand his confusing the sources of notes if he had made them at other points in the text which were not absent from the Bembinus. But would he forget an important and regrettable feature of the manuscript, that all but the last one hundred lines or so of the *Andria* were lost or illegible?

There is perhaps one clue to the source of *An.* 346-8. Bembo quotes the words "vita est" as "vitast", i.e. with prodelision of "est", a feature of the Bembinus which he frequently notes, explicitly and implicitly. So on *Ph.* 357-8 he says "nam quod dixi relictast. ita saepissime scriptum eo in libro invenies, pro 'relicta est', et futurumst pro 'futurum est'". We have seen that he observes this feature in both groups of quotations⁷¹. But both Vat. lat. 3868 and Brasenose 18 read "vita est", not "vitast".

The text of *An.* 346-8 as Bembo prints these lines in the dialogue far surpasses in quality what can be found in the printed editions of his time. It is too good to be ascribed to Bembo's conjectural abilities. Vat. lat. 3868 and Brasenose 18 offer a text which is very close to what Bembo prints but it is not exactly the same. Where else could Bembo

⁷⁰ Of the readings in the dialogue which are in neither the printed edition nor in Vat. lat. 3226 the Brasenose manuscript offers only four: *An.* 921 "moveo"; *An.* 921 "num"; *Heaut.* 1015 omission of "te"; *Ph.* 385 "maxume". The first two are found in printed editions (see above, n. 47). If the manuscript offered "transfert" at *Eun.* 400 or "victum" at *Heaut.* 143, there would be more reason to think that Bembo used it. Cecil H. Clough states that it belonged to Pietro's father ("The Library of Bernardo and of Pietro Bembo", *The Book Collector*, 33 [1984], 305-31, at 309). But I am not aware that there is certain evidence that it did belong to Bernardo or, if it did not, of when Pietro acquired it.

⁷¹ So "domist" at *Ph.* 504 and *Eun.* 545, "egressast" at *Ph.* 732, "adductust" at *Eun.* 826, "ipsast" at *Eun.* 347, "homost" at *Eun.* 549, "rescitumst" at *Hec.* 286, "lucrost" at *Hec.* 287. He never cites a passage with such forms unless they appear in the manuscript. Contrast "quisquam est" (*Eun.* 1); "ipsus est" (*Eun.* 546); "auctus est" (*Heaut.* 627); "ubi est" (*Ad.* 260); "ipsus est" (*Ph.* 852); "quantum est" (*Ph.* 852); "quibus est" (*Hec.* 285), where again in every case he follows the ancient manuscript. At *Eun.* 348 he prints "conclamatum est", where the Bembinus actually has "conclamatumst".

have found the readings which gave these lines such a new and modern look? An obvious candidate is Vat. lat. 3226, the source from which Bembo himself says he took the verses. Some doubt lingers. We know from Bembo's own words in *M* and from comparisons of his and Poliziano's editions that he later added new information to the record of the collation done with Poliziano in 1491⁷². Why did he make no annotation about the readings of these lines in the edition which was very much his personal record of the ancient manuscript? I can give no answer that is not purely speculative. All that we know is that he did not take his knowledge of the text of *An.* 346-8 from *M*. The readings at *Eun.* 400 ("transfert") and *Heaut.* 143 ("victum") are also absent from that edition. He must have had additional sources of information. Until we can find these sources, whether they included another printed edition of Terence owned by Bembo or a collection of notes (perhaps based on the transcription that he had just had done for his friend Inghirami)⁷³, and show that the information which these sources contain is based on a manuscript of the calibre of Vat. lat. 3868, we should accept what Bembo implies in the dialogue, that *An.* 346-8 were among the few lines from the earlier part of the *Andria* that were legible in the manuscript of which he and his father were so justifiably proud.

University of Toronto
Department of Classics

⁷² See above, note 31.

⁷³ See above, note 26.

John MARTYN

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LÚCIO ÂNGELO
ANDRÉ DE RESENDE AND IOHANNES SECUNDUS

The relationship between André de Resende and Jan Everaerts (Iohannes Secundus) has been ignored or given cursory treatment by scholars working on the two authors, despite the fact that it throws considerable light on their lives¹. When they first met in Leuven, there was an age difference of about 12 years, but the three poems written by the precocious young poet, Secundus, in honour of the recently well-established poet, Resende, reveal not only his admiration but also his sympathy and friendship towards the humanist from Évora. The poems appear in his book of Epigrams, and are as follows, with my English translations; the titles are of special interest²:

Epigram 67

Ad Lucium Ang. Andr. Resendium Lusitanum Poetam

*Quod tibi Pierios urbs aspiravit odores
divite qua Delus nat sinuosus aqua,*

¹ Even the very thorough analysis of Secundus' biography in Alfred M. M. Dekker's *Janus Secundus (1511-1536): De tekstoverlevering van het tijdens zijn leven gepubliceerde werk* (Utrecht, 1986) only includes two very brief references to their relationship (pp. 29, 136, c. 5 lines of text). He did not print or discuss *Epigrams* 67, 74 or 75. They were printed, however, without titles, in Francisco Leitão Ferreira, "Vida de André de Resende", *Archiv. Hist. Port.* ix (1914), p. 247, taken by him from Andreas Schottus' *Hispaniae Illustratae* (Frankfurt, 1603), having already appeared in Vol. I of Arnold Mylius' edition of Resende's *opera* (Cologne, 1600), pp. xv-xvi. Ferreira added a brief comment (p. 248), arguing from *Epigram* 67 that Resende may have stayed a few days at the Everaerts house in The Hague, and linking the *Ângele* with his mother, Ângela. Some ideas in this article came from Alberto Rosa.

² The titles and texts (modernized) are taken from the 1541 Utrecht edition of *Ioannis Secundi Hagiensis Opera*. Neither the titles nor the texts were mentioned by Gabriel de Paiva Domingues in his ed. of *Oração de André de Resende ...* (Coimbra, 1982), esp. pp. 82-91, nor by Américo da Costa Ramalho in his "Lucius Andreas Resendius. Porque Lucius?" in *Estudos sobre o Século xvi* (Paris, 1980), pp. 203-213.

- turris ubi vastae moles operosa superbit,
 moeniaque hostili non superata pede,
 5 non honor ille mihi debetur, docte Resendi,
 debetur fratri non honor ille meo.
 Sed sua Thespiades oblectamenta secutae,
 plectraque Phoebaeis aemula pectinibus,
 pertaesae laticesque suos et Apollinis odas,
 10 haeserunt lateri, magne poeta, tuo,
 tectaque cum sacro subierunt hospita vate,
 mox et odorato rore rigatur humus,
 vestiturque locus violis, quas legerat ipsa
 Permessi in ripis Calliope roseis.*

To Lúcio Ângelo André de Resende, Portuguese Poet

- Louvain has breathed on you the Muses' perfumes,
 where the winding Dijle flows with rich water,
 and a massive tower stands high with elaborate base,
 ringed by walls unconquered by hostile feet;
 5 this is an honour not owed to me, learned Resende,
 nor due to my brother either.
 Rather, the Muses have followed their own delights,
 and poetry that rivals the lyrics of Phoebus,
 tired of their own springs and Apollo's odes,
 10 and have attached themselves to your side, great poet,
 entering hospitable halls with their sacred bard;
 soon the earth is soaked with fragrant dew,
 as violets carpet the place, those picked by Calliope
 herself on the rosy banks of Permessus.

Epigram 74

- Ad Lucium Ang. And. Resendum Poetam Monachum
 Angele, ad immeritas laudes ignosce tacenti;
 sic tua declives plectra morentur aquas,
 vocalesque modos illex aurita sequatur,
 mitius et sortis te premat ira tuae.
 5 Nec te perpetuo gravet imperiosa cuculla,
 sed tua purpureus tempora cingat honor,
 quaeque gerit laurum frons, et gerat illa galenum.
 Haec ego. Fatipotens haec rata, Phoebe, velis.*

- To Lúcio Ângelo André de Resende, Poet and Monk
 Ângelo, pardon my silence over undeserved eulogies;
 so may your poetry hold back flowing streams
 and listening oaks follow your melodious verse;
 and may anger over your fate press you more gently.
 5 May the imperious hood not burden you permanently,
 but may the purple honour surround your temples,
 and may your laurel-girt brow wear the red hat too.
 So pray I. Fate-ruling Apollo, please bring it to pass.

Epigram 75

Ad Eundem

- Rebus in adversis animosus, frange superbae
 iura deae dominamque rotam quae singula versat,
 stare loco impatiens. Spera bene; forsitan astro
 adveniet grata hora suo, nec lenta moratur,
 5 cum te, cornuta cinctum sacra tempora mitra,
 sublimem sortis meminisse iuvabit acerbae.*

To the same man

- Undaunted in adversity, break the laws of the proud
 goddess, and the mistress who alone turns the wheel,
 refusing to stand still. Be of good hope; perhaps an hour
 will come to you, welcome with its own star, without slow delay,
 5 when you, exalted, your holy brow girt with cleft mitre,
 will enjoy the memory of your once bitter lot.

The first two epigrams present us with the unparalleled nomenclature of Lúcio Ângelo André de Resende. Nowhere else do Lúcio and Ângelo appear together. The first name was linked with his birthday, and the second with his deep love for his mother³. The first epigram's setting is Louvain, near the family home of the Everaerts brothers in Mechlin. It seems certain that Resende first got to know Secundus, Grudius and Marius while studying under Goclenius in Louvain. This was between

³ As was shown by Costa Ramalho, *op. cit.*, pp. 205-213, and by Domingues, *op. cit.*, p. 90 "Em veneração afectuosa par com sua querida mãe". She died in 1527, while her son was studying theology in France. The usual view is that Resende used Ângelo up to November 1531, and then dropped it for Lúcio, by November 1532; so Ferreira, *op. cit.*, p. 324. He ignored the use of both names at once.

July 1, 1529, the date of a letter sent to Diogo Freire from Louvain, and early December 1530, when he joined the Portuguese ambassador to Charles V, Pedro Mascarenhas, in his mansion in Brussels. He sent one letter from Louvain on June 21, 1531, to Goclenius, but spent almost all of the months between December 1531 and June 1533 in the company of Mascarenhas and the Holy Roman Emperor.

Between December 1530 and February 1532, Resende was mostly in Brussels, and there renewed his contact with young Secundus. By the end of 1529, Secundus had become a client of Aegidius Buslydius, a wealthy collector of Greek and Roman antiquities, in Brussels. He made medallions portraying his patron's sons, Nicolaus and Aegidius. In the summer of 1530, he was admiring the palace of Maximilian Transsylvanus, also in Brussels, and mourning the loss of Maximilian's young wife, Francisca de Haro. But in the summer of 1531, he was clearly living in Brussels, and working his way into the good graces of the Emperor, not only with poems but also with products of his numismatic skills⁴. He only returned to Mechlin in December 1531, and in March 1532 he began his studies under Alciati in Bourges. It seems likely that Resende's satirical comments about Court life and his own prospects led to Epigrams 74 and 75, although they may belong to a third coming-together of the poets, in Spain (see below).

It is possible that Resende and Secundus attended the coronation of Charles V in Bologna in February 1530. This splendid occasion attracted princes, potentates and prelates from all over Europe, together with their families and clients, including, I suggest, two brilliant poets soon to have the Emperor as their patron, Resende and Secundus. Resende was there with his patron, Pedro Mascarenhas, who on December 4, 1530, officially introduced him to the Emperor and his family. The precocious Secundus had already dedicated poems to Charles V and to Margaret of Austria⁵, but it was the coronation in Bologna that gave him his first opportunity to capitalize on his father's earlier links with the Emperor⁶, with poetic eulogies that showed his skill as a poet as much as his high regard for Charles V. His first poem praising the Emperor was dated 1529, *Eleg.* III.8, entitled *De Pace*

⁴ See Dekker, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-45.

⁵ For Secundus' entry into her Court at Mechlin, and dedication of *Eleg.* III.8 to her, see Dekker, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-5, 29.

⁶ With *Ode* 1. His father was appointed by Charles V as President of the High Court of the Netherlands, and had close links with him and his senior advisers.

Cameraci facta inter Carolum imperatorem et Franciscum Galliae Regem (48 vv.), and it was included with his first *Ode*, on the Emperor's crowning in Bologna (*Carolo V Romano Imp. Coronato*, 32 vv.), in a special publication financed by the poet's father and dedicated to the Emperor, which appeared in Antwerp in 1530⁷. Together with them were two poems by Ioannes Dantiscus (the second *De nostrorum temporum calamitatibus* 536 vv. long) and two by André de Resende (a 16 vv. one *De Conrado Goclenio nobili Rhetore*, and 188 vv. *Encomium Urbis et Academiae Lovaniensis*, where Secundus' father had been Rector), which had been printed before in Bologna on 9 December, 1529. Dantiscus, a fine Latin poet and ambassador of the Polish King Sigismund I, certainly attended Charles V's coronation in Bologna, and was a close friend of young Secundus⁸. As was his comrade-in-arms in his Julia love-affair, Petrus Clericus, of Antwerp, who stayed with Dantiscus during the coronation celebrations. Without any proof that Secundus was elsewhere in February 1530, it is very tempting to include him with his poetic friends then staying in Bologna, Resende, Dantiscus and Clericus⁹.

Moreover, Secundus was asked to compose two 6 verse epigrams to accompany an artistic eulogy of the great event. Nicolas Hogenberg of Munich had earlier attracted the attention and patronage of Margaret of Austria, and used the coronation to flatter Charles V¹⁰. He carved a series of 40 etchings depicting the state entry of Charles V and Pope Clement VII into Bologna, and inscribed Secundus' epigrams in the first and last one. Again, it seems likely that both the poet and artist witnessed the event.

A possible objection to this theory might arise from *Epistle I.6 Ad Carolum Sucquetum*, where Secundus wished he could accompany his friend, as he sets out for Italy. However, his worried father stopped him from going: *provida me timidi remorentur verba parentis*. This refers to the summer of 1531, when his father's health was fast deteriorating, and he wanted to improve his youngest son's legal knowledge, while getting out a revised edition of his *Topicorum seu de locis legalibus liber* (Leuven, 1516)¹¹. In the letter, Secundus hopes to follow Sucquet before

⁷ See Dekker, *op. cit.*, p. 27, and Chapter III.

⁸ For Dantiscus, see Dekker, *op. cit.*, p. 45, and Chapter IV.

⁹ For Clericus' relationship, see Dekker p. 30 (dating their friendship's beginning to 1529 or 1530) and pp. 36-8 (as his confidant in the Julia love-affair).

¹⁰ See Dekker, *op. cit.*, Chapter VI.

¹¹ See Dekker, *op. cit.*, p. 37. He does not consider the possibility of Secundus having made the trip to Italy a year earlier.

long, and sings the praises of Italy, but makes no mention of his own visit there. However, Secundus rarely talks about his own exploits in poems written to his friends, and in this case, his rôle in the coronation, albeit a small one, must have been common knowledge to them over a year later. Early in 1530, his father had no call on his services.

After Secundus returned to the Netherlands, he soon became part of the Royal Court, as we have seen. For his literary work, a good library was essential, and one of his epigrams refers to a fine collection, of c. 3,850 books, donated by Canon Jan Harius (Dircz) to the Emperor's library in The Hague: *In bibliothecam Imperatoris Caroli V, quae est in Curia Hagiensi apud Batavos comparata impensis Ioannis Harii Canonici*¹². He also flatters the Emperor on his return with *Elegy II.2 Caroli V. Imp. P.F. Aug. ad Belgas reverso*, and shortly afterwards celebrates his birthday with an *Epigram*, I.21, *In Caroli Quinti Imp. Natalem*, in which the Emperor's bright glory outshines that of Apollo. During this period, the Court's musical director, Nicolas Gombert, set one of his love poems (*Ode X*) to music, which has survived¹³.

Secundus also composed two epitaphs at this time in honour of an old friend of his father, Mercurinus Gattinaria, who had been Chancellor to Charles V, *In Mortem Mercurini a Gattinaria Caroli V Imp. magni Cancellarii*, and *Mercurinus ad Viatorem*¹⁴. These two poems formed part of a collection of 47 poems honouring Gattinaria that was published in Antwerp in 1531. The collection included two poems by Dantiscus, and two possibly by Resende. Again, the three humanists come together, at a far less cheerful occasion than the coronation in Bologna.

In *Epigram* 74, the addition of *Monachum* in the title is of interest. In *Epigram* 67, it was the extraordinary ability of Resende as a Latin poet, *magne poeta*, that dominated the poem. The addition of *Lusitanum* before *poetam* suggests an early moment in their friendship, not long after Resende had arrived in Louvain, hoping to find Erasmus there¹⁵. The Portuguese humanist was soon to make his mark in the Low

¹² See Dekker, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-4.

¹³ The motet for *Ergone vitae quod superest/meae* appears on pp. 40-43 in Dekker's book.

¹⁴ See Dekker, *op. cit.*, Chapter IV.

¹⁵ See his *Encomium Erasmi*, vv. 170-171: *Lovanique arces: hanc te tum fama ferebat/ urbem habitare*; in v. 181, after delays through storms on his way to Louvain, he finds *aberas, et te felix Basileia fovebat. Sorsne deusne mihi invidit?* Resende never caught up with Erasmus.

Countries, but it was not until 1513 that his reputation as a brilliant Latin poet was fully established. In 1529, this impressive visitor from Portugal still had some novelty value. However, by the time Secundus wrote *Epigram* 74, they were both attached to the Court of Charles V. The addition of *monachum* acknowledges the other side of Resende's achievements, his religious devotion and theological studies in Spain and in France, where he had become archdeacon of St. Maxime-les-Baumes, near Marseilles¹⁶. By 1531, he had circulated and published (in Basle) his two scathing attacks on the enemies of Erasmus, in his long *Encomium Erasmi* and his satirical *Carmen ... adversus stolidos politioris literaturae oblatratores*¹⁷. Secundus was also a proud admirer of Erasmus, as appears in his *Eleg. III.5 In reditum Erasmi Roterodami ad Belgas, sed falso nuntiatum* (where *venit amor recti, venit et ipsa Fides, and felix quae talem terra tulisti*), and in his *Epitaphium Desyderii Erasmi Roterodami*, where his intense grief (*flemus et effusis diffluimus lachrymis*) is for the *ingenium sagax et amor virtutis et aequi*, now buried *sub tumulo*. Secundus was to follow him shortly afterwards.

The Dutch love-poet must have been most impressed by Resende, as he got to know him better; however, his prophesies in *Epigram* 74 suggest some naïvety on his part where Resende's chances of a Bishopric were concerned, and even greater unreality in his prayer for the Cardinal's *cappello rosso*. The oaks might follow Resende's poetry, as they followed the music of Orpheus, and Apollo himself might be on his side, but Augustus was no longer on the throne. For the "purple

¹⁶ Soon after infancy, when his father died, Resende was placed in a Dominican convent in Évora (aged 12). His main theological training was in Paris, Marseilles and Aix. In his later years, he was an active Canon of Évora and friend of the Inquisitor General, Henry. Most of Resende's poems were religious in content.

¹⁷ These early works were full of the satirical spirit of Erasmus, whose *Praise of Folly* offended conservative theologians, as Resende's must have done also. His support for Erasmus gradually lessened after his death, but he never turned against him. The tragic death of Cardinal Alfonso in 1540 played a major part in ending Portugal's flirtation with Erasmus and the Humanistic movement. Before then, the enlightened brothers, João and Alfonso, had welcomed Erasmus, according to Resende (*Encomium Erasmi*, 207-210: published 1531):

*Non tibi Lusiadae infesti. Te noster adorat
divus Ioannes fraterque Alphonsus et ipsam
effigiem certe miro venerantur amore,
et volvunt studio libros auroque decorant.*

Once their younger brother, Henry, became Inquisitor General, Erasmus soon went right out of favour.

honour", it was not poetic excellence, nor true piety, nor theological learning that was required, but noble blood, and plenty of gold, enough to bribe either the King or the Pope, or both of them. For the Red Hat, far, far more gold was needed, and normally the bluest of blood, such as a family link with the Vatican or with Royalty. Even if it was offered to an exceptional humanist or theologian, like Erasmus, the cost of maintaining a palace in Rome and countless clients must have appeared prohibitive, unless extensive family riches were available to draw on. Resende's family was never wealthy, and could not boast of illustrious ancestors, as his fellow poet and courtier, Jorge Coelho, maliciously pointed out to him¹⁸. However brilliant his achievements might be in theology and in literature, however attentive he might be to the power-brokers of his day, even a Bishop's mitre could be little more than a dream. And yet dreams can feed ambition, and self-delusion, two very human traits found even in the pious Resende¹⁹.

The renewed promise in *Epigram* 75 of a Bishopric being imminent for Resende was again unreal. However, the words around it show that Resende was suffering from a violent attack of discontentment and frustration, just as distressing to him as the storm sent by Aeolus was to *pious Aeneas* (*Aen.* I, 203 *forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit*, itself modelled on Odysseus' *cri de coeur* in *Od.* xii, 212). But Resende's *sors acerba* was not simply his failure to obtain Church preferment, despite his eulogies of Mascarenhas and of Charles V, and of all the Portuguese Royal Family²⁰. It seems that by 1531 he had become totally disenchanted with Court life, especially the way it treated talented writers.

¹⁸ Resende's relationship with Jorge Coelho was an uneasy one. Coelho's ancestors may have eclipsed those of Resende (like Nicolau Coelho, one of Vasco da Gama's admirals), but at Court, where only buffoons could succeed, Resende argues, *vivat Caelius, uni/cui vatum placet aula* (*De Vita Aulica*, 107-8). Later on, in his notes to his short religious epic *Vincentius* (II.48), he gives some praise to *Coelio, Lusitaniae nostrae ornamento, sive poeticam facultatem, sive Ciceronianae orationis aemulationem spectes*. See José da Silva Terra, "O Humanista Português Jorge Coelho e a sua correspondência com os Cardeais Bembo e Sadoletto", in *Mélanges ... Joucla - Ruau* II (Aix-en-Provence 1978), 1133-1160. In his will, Resende claims to have spent 300,000 *reis* on repairing churches in his charge, but for all his years of hard work, and presents from the King and Infantes, he inherited nothing, and left very little.

¹⁹ As is certainly suggested by *Epigram* 75.

²⁰ The first two were highly praised in his *Genethliacon*, and Resende's elaborate epitaphs for Charles V's foster-son, and sister-in-law (*Beatricis Allobrogum Reginae Carmen*, January 1538) were designed to win his support. Many other poems and prose works were dedicated to Portugal's Royal Family, especially to João III, Sebastian and Henry.

His *ennui* is very evident in his two vicious attacks on the Court and its decadent courtiers, first, his highly satirical *Epistola De Vita Aulica, ad Speratum Martianum Ferrarium Lusitanum* (Brussels, Nov. 1, 1531), and then, his more restrained but sardonic picture of poets' mistreatment in his *Epistola ad Damianum Goium: de Vita Aulica. Poetas ibi iacere* (Évora, Oct. 27, 1535)²¹. Secundus would have enjoyed hearing and then reading the first letter, even if he himself never rejected the princely hands that fed him²².

Whether Secundus joined the entourage of Charles V through André de Resende and his patron Mascarenhas, or through his Mechlin connections and his own very influential father²³, it seems certain that the two poets were in service to the Emperor Charles V, for much of the time from 1531 to 1533. After staying in Brussels from October 1531 until mid-January 1532, Resende left with the Emperor to stay in Cologne, until early February, when the Court set out for Ratisbon (Regensburg), residing there until September 1. While there, the young Prince of Denmark (*Dacia*) died suddenly, to the Emperor's intense grief, which resulted in a fine *Epicedion* in the Prince's honour from Resende's pen²⁴. During September, the party passed through Straubing, Passau and Linz on its way to Vienna, arriving there on September 23. Inside the city, Charles V's army faced that of the brilliant Ottoman sultan, Suleiman II, who, after an ineffectual attack, laid siege to Vienna; but in October he was forced to retire, without a full-scale battle being fought. Soon afterwards, Charles V left for Italy, passing through Spilimbergo (October 26) to Mantua, staying there from November 7 until December 6. While in Northern Italy, Resende visited Venice, to see through the press his pious eulogy of Mascarenhas, in his *Translatio Responsae*²⁵. By December 13, the Emperor had entered the

²¹ Both contain portraits of Courtiers worthy of Juvenal, like the grotesque doctor who specialises in diseases of the rich in the first (vv. 73-103), and the legal critics of Resende, as João's teacher, in the second (vv. 82-101).

²² Some Epigrams are Martial-like in their wit (undertaker-doctors etc.), but there is no biting satire among his works. He was essentially a love-poet, in almost every genre.

²³ His father's high offices were due to the Emperor, as appears in Secundus' 218 verse *epitaph* in his honour.

²⁴ The poem consists of 101 hexameters, full of pathos and sympathy for the Emperor, and indignation over the Prince's untimely death (only 14 years old). The Prince was the nephew and favourite of Charles V, John, the son of King Christian of Denmark and Sweden, Christian II, and of Isabel of Austria, Charles V's sister.

²⁵ After allowing Gil Vicente's anti-Papal *Jubileu de Amor* to be performed before the Papal nuncio, Lorenzo Campeggio, Mascarenhas showed great piety and generosity in

city of his earlier coronation, Bologna, where he stayed until February 1533.

Resende's extraordinary series of lengthy verse publications continued apace, when he once again had access to the prestigious press in Bologna. In January 1533, he published first his *Genethliacon* (873 vv.), dedicated to King João III, and then his *Epicedion* (101 vv.) over the death of Dacia's Prince, and finally his satirical *Epistola de Vita Aulica ad Speratum Ferrarium* (327 vv.), as well as several short poems²⁶. During February, Resende may have visited Rome²⁷, but by the end of the month he was back with Mascarenhas and the Emperor, travelling North. They passed through Pavia, and reached Geneva by March 28. In April, however, they set out for Spain, reaching Barcelona by April 22; there in July, he would have met up with Secundus once more. In his *Iter Hispanicum*, Secundus describes his own trip to Spain, including a stay at Lyon, where the Royal family and their clients took over all available accommodation, forcing Secundus and his friend to stay with a poet, Hilarius Bertulphus, and painter, Corneille de la Haye, old friends of theirs from the Netherlands. In the morning, the King was the centre of attraction; but while the other three dined with an Ambassador, Secundus himself preferred to dine with other local friends. Afterwards, however, he was admitted to the private section of the Royal Court *amici auxilio* (again unnamed). There they watched various plays and dances, put on by the French aristocracy, with the noblest young girls of France and Spain on the stage, in elaborate costumes. After leaving Lyon, Secundus was worried by robbers and by plagues, raging at that time in Nîmes and Montpellier, but he eventually reached Spain, in mid-

searching out (by means of his research assistant, Resende) and purchasing the skulls of Responsa and her companion, as described (with suitable prayers) in Resende's *Translatio sacrarum Virginum et Martyrum Christi, Responsae et sociae eius*. A Cologne convent, and Campeggio, were paid handsomely for the very dubious relics, which were housed in a chapel at Alcácer do Sal, also built at Mascarenhas' expense. For Responsa's sad fate, see J. de Voragine's *Legenda Aurea*.

²⁶ They consist of a poem to *Petreio Aphani suo* (19 vv.), two to the same Ferreira, *ad bellum Turcicum venienti* (14 vv.) and a *Caesare sacramentis militaribus obstricto* (13 vv.), one to *Michaeli Silvio pontifici* (26 vv.) and an ode to *Daciae Principi* (25 vv.).

²⁷ It seems likely that any Classical scholar specializing in Architecture would try to visit Rome when in Italy, even without the religious incentive. Among the recently discovered poems by Resende is one *De Laude urbis Romanae*, including the couplet *Et prius immensum capient oblivia mundum/quam tuus e nostro pectore cedat honor*. It is contemporary Rome that he will never forget, where he also dug up a slab inscribed with an Echo poem, possibly by Martial himself, *in saxo vetustissimo*. Mascarenhas had spent many years there as ambassador to the Vatican.

July, and must have felt relieved to hand over his sister-in-law, whom he had escorted during the journey, to his brother Grudius, who was a member of the Emperor's staff at La Almunia²⁸. It seems certain that he would have met Resende at the Royal Court during the last weeks of July, and it may have been then that Resende's frustration led to Secundus' *Epigram* 75, and to his own departure from the Emperor's Court, with Mascarenhas, for the Portuguese Court in Évora. By 1533, Secundus only had a few years to live, although his growing poetic reputation and increasing popularity with Charles V must have made his future seem very rosy to him. On 29 May, 1534, he became secretary to the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, who had a chance of becoming Pope²⁹. Two years later he joined Charles V in his expedition to North Africa. Unfortunately he fell ill half-way through the journey to the combat zone, and his projected epic in honour of the Emperor, his *Bellum Tunetaeum*, remains as a fragment. From then on he was dogged by ill-health, dying on September 25, 1536, in St. Amand, on the way to becoming Secretary to the Emperor, back in Spain³⁰.

His death was not mourned by Resende, in any surviving poem, at any rate; anyway, at that time it must have paled into insignificance beside the death of Erasmus, on July 12, 1536. Resende lived on for another 37 years³¹, but he never wore the mitre once coveted by him, and promised to him by a brilliant young poet from The Hague. Apollo might still inspire poets, as he had inspired Resende and Secundus, but he no longer controlled Church appointments.

University of Melbourne

²⁸ See Dekker, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-2.

²⁹ Both brothers had excellent prospects; see Dekker, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

³⁰ Only 8 verses of the epic were written. After recovering at home, he turned south, despite having promised his family in Mechlin that he would never return to Spain again, and despite his pleasing new position as secretary to George of Egmond, Bishop of Utrecht. On the way, he visited the Bishop in St. Amand, where a fever ended his short life. See Dekker, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-61. Scholars interested in Secundus who cannot read Dutch with confidence might contact me — I have an English version of the Biography (pp. 19-61).

³¹ Resende's intense grief over the loss of Erasmus appeared in a series of superb Latin poems: see Odette Sauvage, *L'Itinéraire érasmien d'André de Resende* (Paris, 1971). He finally died in his Évora home on 9 Dec. 1573, after many years of semi-retirement, mainly spent in his *Quinta* near the Aqueduct, writing poems, digging up inscriptions and gardening, his three main joys in life. See my article "A Renaissance Picnic at Resende's Quinta", *Portuguese Studies* III (1987), 70-76.

Gilbert TOURNOY

THE UNRECORDED POETICAL PRODUCTION OF ANDREAS AMMONIUS¹

As in other countries of Northern Europe, the development of humanism in England was fostered by a great many Italian scholars, who crossed the Channel hoping to make money out of their talents.

Polidoro Vergilio (c. 1470 - c. 1555), a native of Urbino, wrote a large and influential historical work, the *Anglica Historia*, in which he stated that Cornelius Vitellius (Cortona, c. 1440 - c. 1500) was the first who taught the *bonae litterae* at Oxford²: “Cornelius Vitellius homo Italus ... omnium primus Oxonii bonas literas docuerat”. In fact, Vitellius was preceded by the wandering Milanese scholar Stephanus Surigonus, who passed through Louvain before ending up in England.

According to an old tradition, recorded by Anthony à Wood, the Lucchese humanist Andreas Ammonius was also believed to have stayed in Oxford for a while³: “Andrew, who was an Apostolic Prothonotary, collector for the Pope in England, Latin Secretary to King Henry 8 and a Learned Man, did — as I have just reason to

¹ This article is a revised version of a paper prepared for the Congress (Oxford, 21-24 July 1984) organized by the Society for Renaissance Studies under the title “English Culture and its Continental Background in the Reign of Henry VII”.

² *Polydori Vergilii Urbinatis Anglica Historiae Libri XXVI* (Basileae, Io. Bebel, 1534), p. 600. In the following editions (Basel 1546 and 1555) one reads: “... Oxonii bonis literis iuventutem erudit”. See the critical edition by D. Hay, *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil A.D. 1485-1537*, Camden Series 74 (London 1950), p. 147*. For P. Vergilio see further by D. Hay, *Polydore Vergil, Renaissance Historian and Man of Letters* (Oxford, 1952). For C. Vitelli, see C.H. Clough, ‘Thomas Linacre, Cornelio Vitelli and Humanistic Studies at Oxford’, in *Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas Linacre c. 1460-1527*, eds. F. Maddison, M. Pelling and Ch. Webster (Oxford, 1977), pp. 1-23; and G. Tournoy, ‘New Evidence on the Italian Humanist Cornelius Vitellius (c. 1440 - c. 1500)’, *Lias*, 5 (1978), 13-18.

³ Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses. An Exact History of all the Writers and Bishops who have had their Education in the most ancient and famous University of Oxford ...*, I (London, 1691), col. 14 (a slightly altered text in the third edition by Ph. Bliss (London, 1813), I, col. 20).

conceive — spend some time in Oxon for the sake of Study, while Grocyn, or at least Erasmus, were conversant there ...”.

Ammonius's name is also mentioned in Foster's *Alumni Oxonienses*, but it does not occur in the recent *Biographical Register of the University of Oxford*⁴. And since nothing else points in that direction, we have reason to question Ammonius's stay at England's most famous University.

The period of his life he spent in England is, however, fairly well known, thanks mainly to his friendship with Erasmus. This friendship started almost immediately after Ammonius's arrival in England, the precise date of which, however, is still uncertain.

It is generally assumed that Ammonius crossed the Channel in the train of Silvestro Gigli (1463-1521), the Lucchese bishop of Worcester since 1498. Gigli was sent by Pope Julius II to present King Henry VII with cap and sword (these tokens of esteem were given each year by the Pope to a christian prince, to remind him of his tasks as a defender of Christianity against the Turks⁵. Silvestro Gigli departed from Rome with a suite of 18 men, probably including Ammonius, sometime after May 2nd 1505, and the official ceremony of the presentation of the gifts took place on the 8th of September of the same year⁶. But in the eclogue Ammonius wrote shortly after his arrival in England, and in which he explains the reasons for his departure from Rome and describes the earthly paradise he found, we read (vv. 83-85)⁷:

*Solus iter capio: supero montesque nivesque
Et mare traicio quod cingit ditia regna:
Plana, ingens, fecunda mihi sese Albion offert.*

Whether he travelled alone or together with Silvestro Gigli, the fact remains that he arrived in England probably in the latter part of 1505. Erasmus was already there, and in a letter dated 21.XI.1513 he testifies

⁴ Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses. The Members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714; Their Parentage, Birthplace, and Year of Birth, with a Record of their Degrees ...*, 4 vols (Oxford - London, 1891-1892), I, 22; A.B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford A.D. 1501 to 1540* (Oxford, 1974).

⁵ See Elisabeth Cornides, *Rose und Schwert im päpstlichen Zeremoniell. Von den Anfängen bis zum Pontifikat Gregors XIII.* (Wien, 1967).

⁶ Archivio Segreto Vaticano, *Reg. Vat. 984*, f. 167^r.

⁷ C. Pizzi (ed.), *Andreae Ammonii Carmina Omnia. Accedunt tres epistolae nondum editae* (Firenze, 1958), p. 9.

that⁸: "It was on my admiration for your written works that this very friendship was founded. ... A long time ago our friend Holt showed me some brief passages on trivial subjects you had written quite casually. A taste of them awoke in me at once an admiration and indeed a love of your genius, which I took with me to Italy".

This friendship bore its first-fruits very soon: at the end of that same year 1505 Erasmus applied for a dispensation from Rome permitting him to accept ecclesiastical benefices. It is no doubt thanks to Ammonius, Silvestro Gigli and their influential friends in Rome, that already on January 4th, 1506 this permission was granted by pope Julius II. And it was again Ammonius who, some ten years later, went to considerable lengths to obtain for his friend from pope Leo X that document of incalculable value, decreeing the dispensation from his defect of birth, the dispensation from his monastic vows and a habilitation for apostasy incurred by abandoning the Augustinian habit.

For his part, Erasmus tried to foster his friend's literary aspirations, by publishing a small collection of his poems in Paris in 1511, as he had done before with the poems of his Dutch friend William Hermans some fifteen years earlier⁹. The date and the printer of this first and only early edition of Ammonius's poetical works are still very controversial¹⁰, but the indication of the modern editor, Clemente Pizzi, that it was printed "a Londra ... dal tipografo inglese Iodocus Badius" is certainly incorrect¹¹. This modern critical edition, which appeared in 1958 with the prestigious title *Carmina omnia*, contains only two more poems than the first edition: a short poem in iambic trimeters originally inserted in a letter to Erasmus¹², and another in phalaecian hendecasyllables, addressed to Nicolò Tegrini. The latter came to Rome in December 1503 at the head of the Lucchese embassy in order to congratulate pope

⁸ *The Correspondence of Erasmus...* Translated by R.A.B. Mynors and D.F.S. Thomson, annotated by W.K. Ferguson (Toronto - Buffalo, 1975) II, 269-70. The original Latin text in P.S. Allen (ed.), *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, I (London, 1906), ep. 283, p. 544-5: "... qui hunc amorem ex admiratione scriptorum tuorum hauserim...Ostendat olim Haltus noster nescio quas schedulas de nihili rebus sic neglectim abs te scriptas. Ex harum gustu protinus conceptam admirationem et amorem ingenii tui mecum in Italiam extuli".

⁹ William Hermans's poems were printed 20 January 1497 by Guy Marchand.

¹⁰ See now the introduction to the critical edition of Erasmus's *De ratione studii*, ed. J.-Cl. Margolin, in *Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*, I, 2 (Amsterdam, 1971), pp. 89-94; and J. Machiels, 'Robert en Pieter de Keyser als drukker', *Archief- en Bibliotheekwezen in België*, 46 (1975), 1-32 (esp. pp. 3-8).

¹¹ Pizzi, *Ammonii Carmina*, p. VI.

¹² Allen I, ep. 236.

Julius II on his ascension to the Holy See. Until now, this last piece was reputed to be the oldest poem Ammonius left us: the modern editor, Clemente Pizzi, even dated it back to 1496¹³: “Questo carme ... è riferito in ‘testimonia et elogia’ premessi all’edizione della *Vita Castrucci Antelminelli Lucensis Ducis*, auctore NICOLAO TEGRIMI, ristampata a Lucca nel 1742. Poiché la prima edizione di questa celebre *Vita di Castruccio* fu fatta a Modena per Domenico Rococciola nel 1496, è logico ascrivere questa composizione fra le prime prove di Ammonio nella poesia latina, quando egli aveva appena venti anni”.

He obviously was misled here by the old literary history of Lucca written by Lucchesini, where had been stated that¹⁴ “(pochi faleuci in lode di Nicolao Tegrini) sono uniti alla orazione detta dal Tegrini a Giulio II in un’ antica edizione senza indicazione di luogo e d’anno, ed alla vita di Castruccio”.

Pizzi clearly did not check the original edition of Tegrini’s *Vita Castrucci* present in several Italian libraries¹⁵, but simply relied on the reprint of Lucca 1742. Ammonius’s poem, however, is only present at the end of Tegrini’s *Oratio pro obedientia praestanda Iulio II P.M. pro Lucensi republica, habita die XX mensis Decembris 1503*¹⁶. And even without checking an attentive reading of the very title could have shown him that this poem was to be situated not in 1496, but in 1503. It runs as follows:

“Andreas Arena Lucensis Domino Nicolao Tegrino *oratori ad Iulium II Pontificem Maximum*” (the emphasis is mine). Since pope Julius II was elected only on November 1st, 1503, Tegrini could not act before that date as an envoy of his republic to that pope.

Michele Monaco, who tacitly corrected this error in his outstanding paper, also considered Ammonius’s poem for Nicolò Tegrini to be “il primo che si conosca di Ammonio”¹⁷.

¹³ Pizzi, *Ammonii Carmina*, p. 71, n. 2. Practically the same statement is to be found in C. Pizzi, *Un amico di Erasmo. L’umanista Andrea Ammonio* (Firenze, 1956), p. 16.

¹⁴ C. Lucchesini, *Della storia letteraria del ducato Lucchese libri sette*, Memorie e documenti per servire alla storia del ducato lucchese, 9 (Lucca, 1825), p. 182, n. 1.

¹⁵ See *Indice generale degli incunaboli delle biblioteche d’Italia* (= *IGI*), V, compilato da E. Valenziani - E. Cerulli - P. Veneziani, con la collaborazione di A. Tinto (Roma, 1972), p. 203, n° 9672.

¹⁶ As stated by E.G. Ledos, “Les poésies latines d’Andrea Ammonio della Rena”, *Revue des Bibliothèques*, 7 (1897), 161-76 (p. 163, n. 2).

¹⁷ Michele Monaco, “Note per una biografia dell’umanista lucchese Andrea Ammonio”, *Annali dell’Università di Lecce. Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia*, 7 (1975-76), 87-136 (p. 115).

An interesting feature in the title of this poem is that Ammonius still uses the latinized form of his name, viz. Andreas Arena, whilst the hellenized form Ammonius (from ἄμμος = sand) appears only after his arrival in England. Is it too daring an assumption that his new name originated in the enthusiastic circle of young humanists in England (Thomas More, Erasmus, William Lily ...) who tried their hands at mastering Greek in the very first years of the sixteenth century?

Let us now concentrate upon the young Ammonius, upon the man who still used the latinized form of his name. This form occurs in fact some years earlier, in a philosophical tract, the *Logica secundum mentem Scoti*, written by Stephanus de Flandria, a member of the Order of Servants of Mary. The initiative to publish this work originated with the general of that Order, the Bolognese Antonius Alabantus¹⁸. He called upon Oliverius Iontus de Monte Gallo or Montegallorum, who had been a pupil of Stephanus de Flandria and currently taught logic at the University of Bologna, to correct for publication this tract of his former master. Iontus, being occupied with other important things, looked for a gifted pupil of his own, who could be entrusted with this task, and in a letter dated September 8th, he asked his most talented pupil, Andreas Arena, to take over this burden. Arena at first refused, considering himself unfit for it, but on second thoughts he agreed to his master's proposal, and saw the text through the press. He dedicated it to a countryman of his, Guglielmus Vellutellius from Lucca, whom he considered his patron, in a letter dated September 9th, 1495.

Obviously something must have gone wrong with the dates of these two letters: it is quite impossible to assume that Arena got his assignment on September 8th, refused, but still finished it the following day, and dedicated it to Vellutellius. The more so since he wrote in his own letter: "*Superioribus diebus ... Oliverius Iontus hanc mihi provinciam multis precibus demandavit*". This makes clear that Arena finished the job within a few days, and he most probably asked his professor, just before the tract went to the printer, to incorporate in an official letter the mandate he gave him.

After the letters, more than half the verso side of the first page remained blank, and Arena filled this empty space with two small

¹⁸ For Antonius Alabantus, see the article by G. Magliocco in the *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, I (Roma, 1960), p. 549.

poems (4 and 7 distichs)¹⁹. They are both addressed to the reader, and Arena develops in them two quite traditional themes: in the first one he wishes the book to be spread throughout the world, so that the author's name may become famous, and he encourages it not to be afraid of the attacks of the critics and the envious, since it is protected by Alabantus; in the second he praises Stephanus de Flandria as the very best in his field, and as a honour for his native country and for the Church.

The publication of this booklet, printed by Benedetto Faelli at Bologna on October 14th, 1495²⁰, has its importance for Ammonius's biography. Until now it was generally accepted, even by Michele Monaco, that Ammonius went directly from Lucca to Rome, and then to England²¹. These letters and poems prove that Ammonius studied under Oliverius Iontus at the University of Bologna around 1495, and that he was very much appreciated by his master. It is undoubtedly also in Bologna, that Ammonius took the degree of magister, and some notarial acts still preserved at the Archivio arcivescovile di Lucca prove that this must have been before February 1497²².

By way of conclusion, mention can be made of the very last poems Ammonius wrote in England, just a few months before he died (August 17th, 1517). On July 7th of the year 1517 Jodocus Badius finished the printing of the *Hymni christiani*²³, composed by the French humanist Bernard André (ca. 1452 - ca. 1522), who was made poet laureate by King Henry VII. Andreas Ammonius, Latin secretary to Henry VIII from 1511 onwards, had been asked a few months before by his colleague, Bernard André, historiographer to the Court from 1510 onwards, to contribute some verses to his pious booklet.

Precisely within that same lapse of time, the Pope's decision concerning the second dispensation Erasmus asked for reached England. Erasmus, who had already come to England in August 1516 to consult

¹⁹ For the Latin text of the letters and the poems see below, Texts I-III.

²⁰ *IGI*, V, p. 116, n° 9167.

²¹ Pizzi, *Un amico di Erasmo*, p. 15: "Da Lucca l'Ammonio passò ancora molto giovane a Roma". Monaco, "Note", p. 109. See also Yvonne Charlier, *Erasme et l'amitié d'après sa correspondance* (Paris, 1977), p. 135: "Originaire de Lucques, André Ammonius a fait des études classiques à Rome..."

²² Monaco, "Note", p. 107 and n. 25.

²³ A copy of this very rare volume is in the British Library, C.124.e.18(1). For a complete description of it, see *Imprimeurs et libraires parisiens du XVI^e siècle. Ouvrage publié d'après les manuscrits de Philippe Renouard*, II (Paris, 1969), p. 154, n° 342. See also G. Tournoy, "Two Poems Written by Erasmus for Bernard André", *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 27 (1978), 45-51.

with Ammonius and to prepare the necessary documents for the Pope, had to return there for the official ceremony. On April 9, 1517, in Ammonius's house at Westminster, Erasmus received the dispensation from the hands of his friend, and on May 1st, he took the boat back to the Continent²⁴.

It is not unlikely that Ammonius in that period not only composed a few verses (4 distichs: see Text IV) for André's book, but also persuaded Erasmus to do the same. And perhaps Erasmus equally could not get away from the fact that André had written his *Hymni christiani* at the instigation or at least with some help from his other good friend Thomas More, and so he granted the request for this reason.

And even if after André's death both Erasmus and More expressed their real feelings about him, that does not alter the fact that André's *Hymni* were graced with commendatory verses by the most prominent humanists living in England at that time: Thomas More, William Lily, Giovanni Boerio, Erasmus and Ammonius.

TEXTS

f. a.1r

I

Oliverius Iontus de monte Gallo Bononiae logicam ordinariam docens
Andreae Arenae Lucensi diale<c>ticae cultori diligentissimo S.P.D.

Cum reverendissimus in Christo pater, sacrae theologiae doctor
excellentissimus, magister Antonius Alabantus Bononiensis, servo-
rum divae Mariae prior generalis benemeritus, hoc mihi onus
iniunxisset, ut reverendi praeceptoris mei magistri Stephani de
5 Flandria theologi subtilissimi necnon philosophi et logici perspicacissimi logicam, quam nuper in lucem emiserat, emendarem, sed
cum scolasticorum lectionibus et aliis complurimis non parvi ponderis negociis occuparer, hoc onus aliis reponere decrevi. Multi
equidem in mentem venere, sed nullus te, mi Andrea, visus est
10 aptior. Quare tibi, discipule diligentissime, hoc onus demando et, si
quid esset quod propter doctoris subtilitatem capere non posses, ad
auctorem recurras.

²⁴ Allen, II, p. 150, n. 21; p. 504 (ep. 552) and p. 576 (ep. 584).

Suscipias ergo provinciam hanc, et tuo solito ingenio et diligentia utaris.

15

Vale, sexto Idus Septembris.

II

Andreas Arena Lucensis diale<c>ticae cultor nobilissimo viro Gulielmo Vellutellio Lucensi civi S.

Superioribus diebus, Gulielme Vellutelli, et doctissimus et perspicacissimus praeceptor meus Oliverius Iontus hanc mihi provinciam multis precibus demandavit, ut scilicet opus praeclarissimum et mediusfidius caelitus demissum (cum ipsum graviora distineant)
 5 emendarem et, si quid esset quod cum mei ingenioli exilitate tum propter acutissimi doctoris subtilitatem apprehendere non possem, interprete ipso uterer auctore, logicam videlicet reverendissimi ac excellentissimi patris magistri Stéphani Flandriensis, ordinis fratrum servorum et viri profecto nostra aetate admirandi, cui nihil
 10 deest. Hic non solum diale<c>ticae et philosophiae acutissimus interpres, sed etiam summus divinarum litterarum praeceptor.

Subveritus impar meae cimbae onus, inceperam recusare, sed cum in omni mea vivendi cupiditate praecipuum hoc mihi munus a
 15 superioribus supplicavi, ut aliquod tibi gratum prestarem, nactus occasionem, hoc tibi gratum fore et mei praeceptoris precibus morem gerere existimavi. Quare eiusmodi provinciam hilari animo aggressus sum, et omnia pro mei ingenioli viribus elimavi in ordinemque redegei.

Debetur itaque tibi, vir magnifice, quantuluscunque hic noster
 20 labor, qui non ut tui ordinis quidam negotiosis ac pecuniosis artibus, sed reipublicae gubernatione sequestrata, stu-/diis litterarum indulges, nunc poetas, nunc oratores lectitans, philosophorumque dogmata excolens, nullum denique diem praetermittis, quin aliquid discas eundemque finem discendi facies, quem et
 25 vivendi hoc pacto beatitatem comparaveris sempiternam.

Optandum equidem esset, ut tales in Lucensi republica viri semper eluceant, qui juvenis et pene adolescens, senili quadam

prudentia polles, eoque acumine ut nihil non prudenter consultes.
 Perge igitur fovere litteras, favere doctis, quo tutore nil lividulorum
 30 turbam formido. Omnibus placuisse videbor, si tibi placuero, in
 quo omnem nostram observantiam collocavimus.

Valebis et me, semper ut fecisti, adamabis.

Bononia, quinto Idus Septembris, Mccccclxxxv.

III

Andreas Arena Lucensis ad lectorem

Docte liber, iam pande caput; te perlegat orbis,
 Debeat auctori candida posteritas.
 Ne timeas nasos, Alabanto vindice tutus,
 Rugosos: solus qualibet ire potes.
 5 Et te livor edax et detractor obibit,
 Laedere te morsu nil tamen hi poterunt.
 Zoile, iam fugias tristis repetasque latebras:
 Non haec materia est dentibus apta tuis.

Eiusdem Andreae Arena ad lectorem

Daedalus ingenio, pictura primus Apelles,
 Alcides primus viribus immodicis,
 Magnus Alexander bellis alterque triumphis
 Magnus Pompeius, sed Nero sevitia,
 5 Moribus ingenuis Cato, luxu Sardanapalus,
 Virgilius versu, Tullius eloquio;
 Artibus et medicis prima est Phaebeia proles,
 Dicitur et sophia primus Aristoteles.
 Stephanus in logica genuit quem Flandria foelix,
 10 Quae tanti partus conscia terra fuit.
 Hic sophiae cultor divinae doctor et artis;
 Hic decus est patriae, hic religionis honos.
 Quare opus hoc, lector, cognoscas, candide, sacrum,
 Ad cunctos aditum si cupis esse tibi.

IV

LXXXII^v

Andreas Ammonius regius scribe ad
Bernardum Andream regium poetam

Quum posses miseros elegis describere amores,
Bernarde, et grandi dicere bella tuba,
Divorum potius voluisti pangere laudes,
Et per Dircaeos dulcius ire modos
Nasonisque sacras opponere fastibus odas:
Ille vetustate est, tu pietate prior.
Hoc est officium vatis divumque ministri:
Non tauris, verum laude litare pia.

MISCELLANEA

THE WORD “ANORMIS” IN ERASMUS’ *DE PRAEPARATIONE AD MORTEM*

In a passage of his *De praeparatione ad mortem* (1534) Erasmus tells how the devil comes to two people on their deathbed to test their faith. One of them is a philosopher, versed in Aristotle, the other a simple Christian: *alter philosophiae peritus erat, alter nihil aliud quam christianus, rudis et anormis* (ASD V-1, 384, 116-17). The Aristotelian is readily overcome by the devil’s sophistries, while the unlearned man remains steadfast in the faith.

Concerning the puzzling word *anormis* the editor of Erasmus’ treatise in the Amsterdam-edition, Prof. A. van Heck, remarks (p. 385): “Ce mot ne se trouve ni dans *Th. L. L.* ni dans le *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch*: est-ce un *hapax*? La signification est claire: ‘simple’: *rudis et anormis* ~ l. 124 *rudis*, l. 127 *simplici fide*. On est tenté de l’expliquer comme *a normis* = suivant les règles → stéréotype”.

We should begin by noting that *anormis* is not a hapax legomenon, at least not in Erasmus’ works. In *De pueris instituendis* (ASD I-2, 49, 18-19) he employs the word to characterize the French language: *lingua barbara et anormi[s], quae aliud scribit quam sonat quaeque suos habet stridores et voces vix humanas*. There the meaning is not “simple” or “stereotypical” but “abnormal”, “perverse”, “not following normal patterns”. This is useful inasmuch as the suggested meaning “normal” can now be ruled out. It does not, however, help us understand why Erasmus’ Christian should be termed “abnormal”. Fortunately Erasmus uses the word elsewhere too, in *Adagia* I,1,38 (LB II, 42 C). Explaining the adage *Crassa Minerua* and its variants he first paraphrases and then cites Horace, *Sat.* 2,2,3:

Horatius Philosophum describens, non exactis illis Stoicorum rationibus atque argutiis instructum, sed veluti citra artem, philosophiam

moribus exprimentem, neque tam disertum, quam simplicem ac sincerum,

Rusticus, inquit, anormis sapiens crassaque Minerua.

This, of course, is the clue we need. The adjective *anormis* — a variant form of the classical *abnormis* — is a hapax legomenon in classical literature. Medieval writers use it occasionally, in various senses (see Du Cange). Its root meaning is “deviating from the norm”, “ab-normal”; but Horace uses it in the transferred sense of “departing from the rule by not belonging to some philosophical sect”. So too Erasmus, alluding to the Horatian line can portray the Christian in *De praeparatione ad mortem* as *rudis et anormis*: “unlearned and commonsensical, not led astray by the subtleties of philosophy”.

The Ohio State University,
Department of German

HARRY VREDEVELD

L'“HECASTUS” DE MACROPEDIUS ET LE “LANDJUWEEL” DE GAND (1539)

Lorsqu'au printemps de 1539 Macropedius rédigea la préface de sa pièce *Hecastus*, destinée à Godofridus Montanus, doyen de Eindhoven, il ne semblait pas encore pressentir que son œuvre dramatique allait se modifier profondément.

En effet, cette œuvre est la base du revirement de l'auteur, qui ne publierait plus que des pièces bibliques assez conventionnelles pendant les seize années à venir. Il n'y eut que deux exceptions: la première fut la publication de *Bassarus* en 1540; cette pièce avait déjà été représentée par les élèves de l'école des Frères de la Vie Commune à Utrecht, dont Macropedius fut le recteur de 1532 à 1556. Sa parution avait déjà été annoncée en 1535 lors de la publication de *Rebelles* et *Aluta*. *Bassarus* n'était donc rien de nouveau, mais les admirateurs de Macropedius voulaient tellement pouvoir lire une nouvelle œuvre de leur auteur aimé. Celui-ci y ajouta des remarques concernant le caractère inoffensif de cette comédie. L'auteur réfuta également des critiques qui portaient sur le caractère moqueur de la pièce vis-à-vis du clergé et des autorités et répéta les objectifs de son théâtre. Macropedius voulut sans doute prouver qu'aucune de ses pièces n'avait suscité des réactions négatives. Pourtant, parmi ces pièces-là figure *Andrisca* (publiée en 1538), qui met en scène l'adultère d'un prêtre.

Il y eut une deuxième exception. Plus tard, dans la réédition de ses pièces (1552-1553) Macropedius a mis l'accent sur le caractère orthodoxe de ses points de vue et sur les bonnes intentions de ses critiques (surtout sur le clergé). Quelques additions, e.a. à *Rebelles* et *Petriscus*, ses deux pièces qui traitent de la vie scolaire, devaient étayer ces énoncés mais, en somme, ce procédé d'intercaler des additions dans les pièces mêmes en diminue la valeur dramatique, même si Macropedius n'a pas changé leur fond.

La publication de *Hecastus* en 1539 fut un vrai tournant dans son œuvre. Comment ce tournant peut-il être expliqué?

A part la plainte permanente de Macropedius qu'il avait trop de travail à Utrecht et que le temps lui manquait de bien polir ses ouvrages,

à part un affaiblissement de sa “vis comica”, comme l’a prétendu Th. W. Best¹, les circonstances dans lesquelles parut *Hecastus* peuvent fournir une explication valable.

Pendant l’été de 1539 à Gand, dix-neuf Chambres de rhétorique essayaient de donner une réponse à la question posée lors du concours: “tWelc den mens stervende het meest tot troost is” (En quoi consiste la plus grande consolation de l’homme mourant?). Plusieurs pièces prétendaient que seule la foi peut sauver l’homme se trouvant devant son Créateur. Dans certains refrains présentés dans une autre partie du même concours on affirmait que les moines offrent le plus de folies au monde.

Les réactions officielles furent véhémentes et même un peu excessives. Les rhétoriciens furent soupçonnés d’avoir introduit des positions réformatrices dans leurs pièces. La publication des textes fut prohibée et les actions des Chambres furent entravées. De la même façon le théâtre scolaire fut scrupuleusement contrôlé.

Il me semble très probable qu’à ce moment crucial, Macropedius soudainement a pris peur des implications que ses pièces pourraient avoir.

La dérision du clergé et la description de certains aspects réalistes de la vie quotidienne n’étaient plus considérées comme étant inoffensives. De plus, le rôle important de *Fides* (la foi) dans *Hecastus* pouvait facilement être interprété comme un témoignage de la sympathie de l’auteur à l’égard de la Réforme luthérienne avec son idée de “sola fides”. Macropedius révisa la pièce en 1550 en y ajoutant quelques passages (afin de prouver qu’il était resté fidèle à l’Église), sans en modifier vraiment le fond.

Bien que les insinuations malveillantes n’eussent que peu de bienfondé (puisque les *vraies* prises de position de Macropedius étaient plutôt de nature érasmiennne que de tendance luthérienne), l’auteur préféra se mettre à l’abri des critiques en expliquant fréquemment l’innocuité et l’orthodoxie de ses prises de position et en évitant par la suite les sujets controversés.

Frank LEYS

¹ *Macropedius* (New York, 1972), p. 137, p. 153 et p. 169.

NOTE SUR LA BIOGRAPHIE DE JACQUES YETZWEIRT

La biographie du poète néolatin Jacobus Yetzweirtius (ou Yetzweirt) telle qu'elle se trouve dans les manuels traditionnels¹ est assez courte et remarquablement incomplète.

Yetzweirt naquit à Bergues-Saint-Winoc en 1541, fit quelques voyages dans sa jeunesse² et entra dans l'armée espagnole vers 1568. Son exploit le plus connu est sa participation active à la reconquête d'Audenarde par les troupes du roi après une occupation de quelques semaines par les gueux de Jacques Blommaert. À la demande de l'abbé de l'abbaye Saint-Pierre à Gand il écrit un grand poème épique sur le siège qu'il a vécu: *Aldenardias*³, publié à Gand en 1573, un an après les faits racontés. Ce poème est précédé de quelques éloges de A. Ketelle, J. Hammius, Ph. Morus et G. Volcardus.

Certains poèmes de Yetzweirt peuvent être trouvés dans des recueils de poètes contemporains⁴; d'autres poètes contemporains ont exprimé leur appréciation⁵.

Après la publication de l'*Aldenardias* l'auteur semble s'être établi à Gand⁶. Mais à partir de là les sources biographiques se taisent unanimement.

¹ Voir De Schrevel A.C. dans *Les gloires de la Flandre Maritime et de la Flandre gallicante au XVI^e siècle* (1904), pp. 44, 72; Roersch A. dans *Biographie nationale* XXIX (1957), 873-876; Leys F. dans *Moderne Encyclopedie der Wereldliteratuur* vol. 10 (1984) p. 315. L'information leur est fournie par des auteurs comme Marchantius, Sanderus, Hofman Peerlkamp etc.

² Ceci est affirmé dans l'œuvre même de l'auteur. Voir J. Yetzweirt dans Epistola XII à J. Sluperius (dans le recueil *Poemata* de celui-ci, publié en 1575), écrite à Ypres en 1563, v. 1:

Qui nuper Scotici venio de tractibus orbis, ...

³ *Aldenardias, sive de subdola ac furtiva Guesiorum in civitatem Aldenardensem irreptione inauditisque ibidem flagitiis designatis, de senatus civiumque laudabili fide et constantia, sacerdotum postremo cruentis martyriis et turpissima Guesiorum fuga poema.*

⁴ 2 épîtres (de 1563 et de 1568) à J. Sluperius, qui lui en envoya une autre (de 1573, publiées toutes les trois en 1575); un éloge pour Viglius ab Aytta, ajouté au testament de celui-ci (publié en 1743) et une épître à Joanna Othonia (probablement de 1577, cf. infra) avec une réponse d'elle (deux éditions de 1617).

⁵ un poème de Hieronymus Du Mortier (publié en 1620 à Arras dans le recueil *Nobilis viri D. Hieronymi Du Mortier Insulani poemata posthuma*).

⁶ Ainsi Du Mortier dédie son poème au "Gandavensis" J. Y.; il dit aussi avoir reçu un poème de son destinataire.

Cependant l'indication de sa demeure nous a permis de trouver une petite trace qui — peut-être — permettra de compléter sa biographie. On peut — en effet — lire le nom de “jonkheer Jacob Yetzweert” sur la liste des membres du comité des XVIII, fondé à Gand le 1 novembre 1577 en vue de gérer l'administration locale de la nouvelle république calviniste gantoise⁷.

Ce qui nous surprend le plus dans cette donnée, c'est le fait que Yetzweert ait changé de camp. Le porte-enseigne qui avait aidé à libérer Audenarde se trouvait là parmi des calvinistes parfois très fanatiques⁸.

De cette manière il est possible de mieux comprendre quelques données concernant notre auteur. D'abord il y a sa relation avec des personnes appartenant au camp réformateur: G. Volcardus et J. Othonia.

Gisbertus Volcardus, qui en 1573 dédia une élogie de 24 vers à l'*Aldenardias*, fut le maître de la troisième classe de l'école latine fondée à Gand en juin 1580 par les autorités calvinistes⁹. Joanna Othonia — elle aussi — est bien chez elle dans les cercles de ceux qui embrassaient la réforme à Gand. Son père, Jean Otho, avait eu beaucoup d'ennuis à cause de sa conviction. La famille de son mari, Guillaume Mayaert, elle aussi donna cours à la cause de la nouvelle foi¹⁰. Il y a aussi Daniel Otho, qui fut le collègue de Volcardus; il enseigna à la cinquième classe¹¹. Les épîtres échangées entre J. Othonia et Yetzweert font preuve d'une certaine affection mutuelle et — en plus — elles doivent dater du moment crucial (vers 1577)¹².

⁷ Voir Despretz A., “De instauratie der Gentse Calvinistische Republiek (1577-1579)” dans *Handelingen der Maatschappij voor Geschiedenis en Oudheidkunde te Gent* XVII (1963), pp. 130 et 135. L'auteur précise avoir consulté les “Keurresolutiën” de cette période; toutes les versions de la première liste des XVIII contiennent le nom de Yetzweert. La composition du comité changeant de temps en temps, la durée de sa présence au sein de celui-là ne peut être affirmée avec certitude. On peut s'étonner du fait que même Despretz n'associe pas le membre du comité au poète de l'*Aldenardias*; il déclare même ne rien savoir sur J. Yetzweert (p. 135), sauf qu'il fut un “notable”, un rentier.

⁸ Voir Despretz A., *o.c.* p. 137 et tant d'autres qui ont évalué le travail des XVIII.

⁹ Voir Fredericq P., “L'enseignement public des calvinistes à Gand”, dans *Travaux du cours pratique d'histoire nationale*, t. I (1883), pp. 70-71; Decavele J., “Kerk en onderwijs tijdens de Gentse calvinistische republiek”, dans *Het einde van een rebelse droom* (Gent, 1984), p. 68.

¹⁰ Son beau-frère Lucas Mayaert appartient aussi au comité des XVIII (en 1578, après un changement de sa composition) et il fut pensionnaire à Gand de 1578 à 1586.

¹¹ Voir les sources indiquées dans la note n° 9.

¹² Il y a un double argument pour cette date: l'épître de J. Yetzweert a été adressée à J. Othonia, “veuve de Guillaume Mayaert” (1) à l'occasion de sa rentrée à Gand (2).

Une autre conclusion possible est que le silence total des sources littéraires (surtout catholiques) du seizième siècle sur la dernière partie de la vie de Yetzweirt est plus facile à comprendre, puisqu'elles sont de la même façon réticentes sur l'épisode des XVIII à Gand.

Pussemerstraat 29
9000 Gent

Frank LEYS

TRAIECTUM SUPERIUS = MAASTRICHT
(Ad J. Cochlaeum, *Germ.* VIII 27)

Johannes Cochlaeus in *Brevi Germaniae Descriptione* VIII 27, ubi de Brabantia agitur, post Mechliniam, Silvam Ducis et Lovanium reliqua Brabantiae oppida adfert, dicens: "Cetera sunt Bruxelle, Berge, Traiectum superius". Quod ita verum est germanice in editione a K. Langosch parata¹: "Die übrigen sind Brüssel, Bergen (rectius dicendum: Bergen-op-Zoom), weiter oben Utrecht". Haec autem oppidorum series quia contra veritatem historicam et geographicam aperte pugnat, huiusmodi notula aucta est: "Bei der Aufzählung fällt auf ... dass Utrecht noch zu Brabant gerechnet wird", qua error Cochlaei subindicatur. At in errorem lapsus est interpres, non Cochlaeus, qui alio loco Traiectum sive Utrecht recte descripsit nihil ad Brabantiam referens. At *Traiectum Superius* altera est urbs, nempe Maastricht, quae et Traiectum ad Mosam, interdum et Traiectum Baetasiorum nominatur (sicut et Utrecht etiam Traiectum Inferius et Ultraiectum nominatur).

Cochlaeus Traiectum ad Mosam, etsi a continuatione terrae Brabantinae aliquantum distat, iustissimo iure inter ducatus illius oppida recenset. Etenim ab anno 1284 ad 1632 indivisum erat condominium ducis Brabantiae et episcopi principis Leodiensis.

Mihi etiam meam hac in re culpam confiteri necesse est. Nam parum attentus nuper in notula quadam de quibusdam nominibus urbium Germaniae Inferioris perperam scripsi Traiectum Inferius esse Maastricht, Superius esse Utrecht. Vide *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms and Legacy*. Edited by Albert Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia, U of Pennsylvania Press 1988), vol. II, p. 208, n. 2. Quem errorem foedum benevolus lector, oro, diligenter corrigat.

J. IJSEWIJN

¹ Johannes Cochlaeus, *Brevis Germanie Descriptio* (1512) ... Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert von K. Langosch (Darmstadt 1960; 1976³), p. 155 et n. 352.

INSTRUMENTUM CRITICUM

CASTIGATIONES ERASMIANAE, IX

Erasmi *Opera Omnia* II 4(1987, 5-6(1981).

Tres tomi *Adagia 1501-3000* sive *II vi 1 - III x 99* comprehendunt a Felice Heinimann et Emanuele Kienzle critice edita et adnotata. Editoribus auxilium tulit Silvana Seidel-Menchi, quae adagium 2201 (*Sileni Alcibiadis*) curavit.

Brevis esse possum in proferendo iudicio: opus est omni admiratione dignum. Adagia quam maxima cura et peritia edita sunt; adnotationes semper sunt ad rem atque ingentis doctrinae messis laetissima. Etiam typographo et correctoribus sua impertiatur laus. Vix uno aut altero parvulo mendo nullum humanum opus esse omnino perfectum ostendit, at sensus numquam vel obscuratur vel detorquetur. Pergant omnes ut coeperunt, et mox nobis cetera Adagia eadem prudentia eademque cura parent.

Paucissima itaque sunt quae observare velim. Addam etiam elenchum vocabulorum, quae in Thesauro Linguae Latinae nondum reperiuntur et inter legendum exscripsi. Interdum huiusmodi vocabula editores etiam in notas rettulerunt; sunt autem et alia, quae eos fugerunt. Difficile dictu est quae vocabula ipse Erasmus procuderit, quae vero a decessoribus aut aequalibus in usum adsumpserit.

Observatiunculae ad textus et notas:

II 4, p. 61,15: lege “diutule”, non “diutile”.

II 5, p. 33, nota ad 216: Verbum *refocillandi* christianum inde a saeculo XV^o et fortasse etiam prius valde commune est apud scriptores Italos (e.g. apud Pontanum).

II 5, p. 36,349: malim post “partem” ita distinguere: “... partem; existimabit ...”; sed concedo aliter legi posse.

II 5, p. 115, nota ad 237 (cui adiunge II 4, p. 80,456 et 463): “animalculum” vocabulum ab Erasmo esse procusum adfirmare non ausim. Eiusmodi diminutivis litterae renatae pullulant. “Animalculum” postea saltem apud physicos saepius recurrit. Vide e.g. *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 33 (1984), p. 323 sub 1.4 (Pitkäranta).

II 5, p. 212,136: Scribendum esse videtur “peregrinum”, non “peregrinam”. Nam et infra (138) “canis alienus” masculini est generis.

II 5, p. 220,311 “Nunc ...” usque ad 313: “... omnino”, inclinatis litteris erant scribenda verba Auli Gellii (I 9.8).

II 5, p. 232,577: malo “Manibus” capitali littera distinguere.

II 5, p. 234,644-45: Versus hexameter latere videtur: “Sola < que > cum solis habeat commercia terris”. At utrum casu exciderit an aliunde arcessitus sit mihi parum liquet.

II 6, p. 376,663: lege “Boetius”, non “Boeotius”.

II 6, p. 408 ad 298: Cfr. Rudolfus Agricola in epistola ad Adolphum Occonem medicum (ed. Hartfelder, 11), Coloniae 19 X 1481: “Magister Egbertus Campensis, ὁμότεχνος tuus”.

Elenchus vocabulorum recentiorum

Post vocabulum indicatur Adagii numerus et versiculus typographicus.

Alcimia ars:	1956, 688.
Animalculum:	1590, 465 et 463; 2115, 237.
Argentulum:	1997, 182.
Asservator:	1876, 939.
Astricola:	2853, 488.
Avidiusculus:	2539, 387.
Bibacitas:	1778, 104.
Blanditiolae:	1632, 469.
Cerdonica (ars):	2529, 294.
Cicernus,-a,-um:	1547, 835.
Circumvolutio:	1702, 98 et 106 (<i>sumptum e Marsilio Ficino</i>).
Coacervator:	1801, 45.
Comperendinator:	1961, 734-5.
Deprodere:	2942, 366.
Fruementigena:	1547, 857.
Frustulatim:	1933, 361.
Galea = navis:	1900, 260.
Homotechnus:	2601, 298.
Imitativus:	2676, 922.
Indilutus:	1701, 75.
Inidoneus:	2974, 579.
Iniuriola:	2723, 223.
Manivorus:	1929, 313.
Molitoria lex:	1915, 175.

Obungere:	1798, 334.
Pauciloquus:	1949, 594.
Perdecet:	1860, 768.
Petricosus:	2878, 679.
Placentula:	2693, 95.
Pomaceus:	1930, 327.
Popinarius:	2684, 1001.
Sesquihaereticus:	1765, 903.
Stipulaceus:	1865, 827.
Subventaneus:	2621, 105.
Summarius:	1824, 342.
Suppullulascere:	1686, 211.
Titanicus:	2601, 645.
Trunce:	1592, 482.
Vaccula:	1825, 349.
Virgifer:	1681, 159 et 163.

Horum vocabulorum complura inventa sunt ut vox Graeca Latine ad litteram redderetur: e.g. Subventaneus = ὑπηνέμιος.

J. IJSEWIJN

NUNTII

1

WESSEL GANSFORT AND NORTHERN HUMANISM

In commemoration of Wessel Gansfort (ca. 1419-1489) a conference is being organized at the University of Groningen from August 29-31, 1989.

Together with Rudolph Agricola, Wilhelmus Frederici, Alexander Hegius, Rudolph von Langen, Antonius Liber and others, Wessel Gansfort was an outstanding member of the famous Aduard Academy. This group of scholars introduced the *studia humanitatis* to northern Europe, thus providing the basis for the work of Erasmus, Melancthon and a whole score of sixteenth-century men of letters.

Abstracts and proposals for thirty-minute papers are invited upon the entire range of issues and questions concerning Wessel Gansfort and in particular fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Northern Humanism. The languages of the conference are English, German, and French. Deadline for proposals is March 15, 1989; notification of acceptance will be by May 1, 1989.

Send all inquiries and proposals to the secretary of the conference: Drs G. C. Huisman, Curator of Manuscripts and Rare Books, University Library, University of Groningen, Broerstraat 4, NL-9712 CP Groningen, The Netherlands.

2

SEPTIMUS ACADEMIAE LATINITATI FOVENDAE CONVENTUS

Septimus conventus internationalis Academiae Latinitati fovendae anno 1989 Erfordiae Thuringorum habebitur a die 31^a mensis Iulii ad 5^{am} mensis Augusti. Die 31^a Iulii conventus participes Erfordiae accipientur. Diebus 1-3 Augusti sessiones convenient, item Bibliotheca Amploniana et cetera monumenta tum Erfordensia cum Gothana visentur. Die 4^a conventus Berolinum transferetur et in via Wimaria, Hala Saxonum et Witteberga urbes visentur (imprimis bibliothecae et alia loca academica).

Die 5^a Augusti conventus Berolini in Musaeo Publico ad aram ante C annos Pergami effossam finietur et concludetur.

Totius conventus argumentum tractandum erit de studiis classicis,

quae a Petrarca usque ad Philippum Melanchthonem in variis Europae partibus floruerunt.

Plura scire si velis, scribes ad Professore em. Johannem Irmscher, Nordenstrasse 49, DDR-1110 Berlin, D.D.R.

3

SOCIETAS INTERNATIONALIS STUDIIS NEOLATINIS PROVEHENDIS

Nuntii Novissimi

1. Septimus conventus internationalis diebus 7-14 mensis Augusti 1988 habitus est in studiorum Universitate *Victoria* in Universitate Torontonsi apud Canadenses. Conventum optime paravit et moderata est Germana Warkentin; Societatis praeses erat Laurentius V. Ryan Stanfordensis.
2. Octavus conventus habebitur in studiorum Universitate Hauniensi apud Danos, diebus 12-17 mensis Augusti 1991.
3. Waltharius Ludwig, professor Hammaburgensis, electus est Societatis praeses in annos 1988-1991. Alter a praeside electus est Franciscus Tateo, professor Bariensis.
4. Societatis a secretis etiam in proximos annos erit Roger Green, Department of Humanity, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, Fife KY16 9AJ, Scotland, U.K.

INSTRUMENTUM BIBLIOGRAPHICUM
NEOLATINUM

apparaverunt

J. IJsewijn, G. Tournoy, D. Sacré, M. de Schepper

Appellatio ad auctores:

Auctores librorum et commentationum de rebus neolatinis enixe rogamus ut nuntium de novis opusculis nobis mittant (in Seminarium Philologiae Humanisticae, Blijde-Inkomststraat 21, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium), quo citius in hoc instrumentum possint referri.

SIGLA:

ACNG

= *Acta Conventus Neolatini Guelpherbytani. Proceedings of the Sixth International Neo-Latin Congress, Wolfenbüttel, August 1985*. Ed. by M. Di Cesare, Stella Revard, F. Rädle. Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies (Binghamton, State University of New York, N.Y. 13901, 1988). Ipsum librum, dum hanc bibliographiam componimus, nondum vidimus, sed opuscula ope elenchi nobis ad eum finem missi, quoad fieri potuit, rettulimus, pauca variis de causis in annum proximum distulimus.

Agricola

= F. Akkerman and A.J. Vanderjagt (Eds.), *Rodolphus Agricola Phrisius (1444-1485). Proceedings of the International Conference at the University of Groningen 28-30 October 1985* (Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1988).

BHR

= *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* (Genève).

Call. Esp.

= *Callimaco Esperiente. Poeta e politico del '400. Convegno internazionale di Studi (San Gimignano, 18-20 ottobre 1985)*. A cura di G.C. Garfagnini (Firenze, L.S. Olschki, 1987).

César

= Chevallier R. (ed.), *Présence de César. Actes du colloque des 9-11 décembre 1983. Hommage au doyen Michel Rambaud*, Caesarodunum (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1985).

De Lisio (1987)

= *Letteratura fra centro e periferia. Studi in memoria di Pasquale Alberto De Lisio*. A cura di G. Paparelli e S. Martelli, Pubblicazioni dell' Università degli Studi di Salerno, Sezione Atti, Convegni, Miscellanee, 15 (Salerno, Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1987).

- GSLI* = *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* (Torino).
HL = *Humanistica Lovaniensia* (Leuven).
IMU = *Italia medioevale e umanistica* (Padova).
Jacobsen = *A Literary Miscellany Presented to Eric Jacobsen*. Edited by Gr. D. Caie and H. Nørgaard, Publications of the Department of English, 16 (University of Copenhagen, 1988).
JESU = *Les Jésuites parmi les hommes au XVI^e et XVII^e siècles. Actes du Colloque de Clermont-Ferrand (avril 1985)*, publiés par G. et G. Demerson, B. Dompnier et A. Regond, Fac. des Lettres et Sc. hum. de l'Univ. de Clermont-Ferrand II, N.S., 25 (Clermont-Ferrand, 1987).
JMRS = *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* (Durham, N.C.).
Lit-Laer = *Litteratur og Laerdom. Dansk-svenske nylatindage april 1985*. Redigeret af Marianne Alenius og Peter Zeeberg, Renaessancestudier, 1 (København, Museum Tusculanums Forlag, 1987).
MEFRM = *Mélanges de l'école française de Rome: Moyen Age - Temps modernes*, t. 99 (1987).
Properzio = *Properzio nella letteratura italiana. Atti del convegno nazionale (Assisi, 15-17 novembre 1985)*. A cura di S. Pasquazi (Roma, Bulzoni, 1987).
RIN = *Rinascimento* (Firenze).
RPL = *Respublica Litterarum* (Lawrence, Kansas).
RQ = *Renaissance Quarterly* (New York).
Suppl. Kristeller = *Supplementum Festivum. Studies in Honor of Paul Oskar Kristeller*. Edited by J. Hankins, J. Monfasani, Fr. Purnell, jr., Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies, 49 (Binghamton, N.Y., State Univ. of N.Y., 1987).
S.V.Br. = *Studia varia Bruxellensia ad orbem graeco-latinum pertinentia. Dertig jaar Klassieke Filologie aan de Vrije Universiteit Brussel*. Edd. Cecilia Saerens, Rudolf De Smet, Henri Melaerts (Leuven, Uitgeverij Peeters, 1987).
WBN = *Wolfenbütteler Barock-Nachrichten* (Wiesbaden).
WRM = *Wolfenbütteler Renaissance Mitteilungen* (Wiesbaden).
Zaccaria = *Studi in onore di Vittorio Zaccaria in occasione del settantesimo compleanno*. A cura di M. Pecoraro, Università degli Studi di Padova, Quaderni dell'Istituto di Filologia e Letteratura italiana (Milano, Ed. Unicopli, 1987).

1. GENERALIA

1.1. Bibliographica

Bibliographie internationale de l'Humanisme et de la Renaissance, XIX: Travaux parus en 1983 (Genève, Droz, 1987).

The Neo-Latin News XXXV, in: *Seventeenth Century News* (Pennsylvania State University, 1987).

Alvar Ezquerro A. - Arévalo González Alicia, *Bibliografía de los estudios clásicos en España 1985* (Madrid, Sociedad española de estudios clásicos, 1987). Cap. 11 (pp. 71-74): "Pervivencia del Mundo clásico"; — Id., *Bibliografía de los estudios clásicos en España 1986 (y adiciones de años anteriores)* (Madrid, Sociedad española de estudios clásicos, 1988). *Comprehendit etiam studia humanistica.*

Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. Alphabetischer Katalog 1501-1840. Voraus-Ausgabe (München, London, New York, Oxford, Paris, 1987 sqq.).

Chiabò Maria, con la colaboración de Silvia Vargas Alquicira, *Catálogo de los documentos latinos del fondo jesuítico del archivo general de la nación de la Ciudad de México*, Cuadernos del Centro de Estudios Clásicos, 21 (México, U.N.A.M., Instituto de investigaciones filológicas, 1987). *Ple-raque sunt documenta ecclesiastica (brevia, vota, etc.); aliqui tractatus philosophici et rara carmina.*

Kristeller P.O., *Iter Italicum. Accedunt alia itinera...*, vol. III: *Alia Itinera, I: Australia to Germany: Index.* Compiled by Bonnie D. Kent and Ronald Rainey in collaboration with the author (London, The Warburg Institute; Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1987).

Oberlé Gérard, *Amoenitates poeticae latinae modernae sive Catalogus librorum poetarum latinorum sec. XI-XX - Poètes néo-latins en Europe (XI-XX^e s.)* (Manoir de Pron, Montigny-sur-Canne, F-58340 Cercy-la-Tour, France, 1988). *Describuntur libri DLXXXV, quos inter multi sunt rarissimi.*

Sacré D., "Le latin vivant: les périodiques latins", *Les Études Classiques*, 56 (1988), 91-104.

Sociedad española de estudios clásicos, *Bibliografía de los estudios clásicos en España (1939-1955)* (Madrid, 1956); Ead., *Bibliografía de los estudios clásicos en España (1956-1965)* (Madrid, 1968). Cap. XIV: "Influencia del mundo clásico".

1.2. *Historica*

Grafton A. - Jardine L., *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in 15th-16th Century Europe* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard U.P., 1986).

Der Humanismus und die oberen Fakultäten. Hrsg. von G. Keil, B. Moeller und W. Trusen, Mitteilung XIV der Kommission für Humanismusforschung (Weinheim, VCH Verlag, 1987).

IJsewijn J., "Neo-Latin: an Historical Survey", *Helios* (Special Issue: *Latinitas: The Tradition and Teaching of Latin*), 14 (Lubbock, Texas, 1987), 2, 93-107.

Ludwig W., "Neulateinische Literatur", in Habicht W., Lange W.-D. e.a. (edd.), *Der Literatur Brockhaus*, 2. Band: *Fu-Of* (Mannheim, F.A. Brockhaus, 1988), pp. 694-696.

Rabil A., jr. (ed.), *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms and Legacy*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, U of Pennsylvania Press, 1988). *Tractantur singulae*

regiones, auctores maioris momenti (e.g. Erasmus), argumenta et disciplinae.

ITALIA

Cultura umanistica nel Meridione e la stampa in Abruzzo: Atti del Convegno 12-14 novembre 1982 (L'Aquila, 1984).

Buck A., "Überlegungen zur moralistischen Literatur des italienischen Renaissance-Humanismus", *ACNG*, pp. 581-596.

Falco R., "'Litterae' e 'philosophia' nel rapporto tra Ermolao Barbaro, Antonio de Ferrariis e la cultura Aragonese", in *De Lisio* (1987), pp. 261-284.

Füssel St., "'Quo me Phoebe rapis...' Überlegungen zum Dichterselbstverständnis im italienischen Späthumanismus", *ACNG*, pp. 33-44.

Holmes G., *Florence, Rome and the Origins of the Renaissance* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1986).

Kristeller P.O., "Latin and Vernacular in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Italy", *Journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association*, 6 (1985), 105-126. Versio recognita commentationis, quae primum germanice est edita in *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch*, 59 (1984), 7-35.

Rusconi, R., "'Ex quodam antiquissimo libello'. La tradizione manoscritta delle profezie nell'Italia tardomedioevale: dalle collezioni profetiche alle prime edizioni a stampa", in *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages*, edd. W. Verbeke, D. Verhelst and A. Welkenhuysen, *Mediaevalia Lovaniensia*, I, XV (Leuven, University Press, 1988), pp. 441-472.

ITALIA: ARETIUM

Black R., "Humanism and Education in Renaissance Arezzo", in *I Tatti Studies. Essays in the Renaissance*, 2 (Firenze, Villa I Tatti, 1987), pp. 171-237.

ITALIA: NEAPOLIS

Bentley J.H., *Politics and Culture in Renaissance Naples* (Princeton Univ. Press, 1987).

ITALIA: SARDINIA

Cadoni E., "Umanisti e cultura classica nella Sardegna del 1500", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 59-67.

ITALIA: SULMONA

Codice diplomatico Sulmonese. Raccolto da Nunzio Federigo Faraglia (1888). Riedizione a cura di G. Papponetti (Comune di Sulmona, 1988). Eduntur documenta annis 1042-1502 latine, italice et mixta lingua scripta. In fine (pp. 461-466) additum est *Glossarium* valde utile.

ITALIA: VALDELSA

Fioravanti G., "La cultura in Valdelsa al tempo di Callimaco", in *Call. Esp.*, pp. 217-245.

CROATIA

Domljan Ž., "Biographische Sammlungen und Lexika bei den Kroaten: ein Beitrag zur kroatischen Kulturgeschichte", *Anzeiger Oesterreich. Akad. der*

Wissenschaften, Philos.-Histor. Klasse, 124 (1987), 153-169. Incipit a saeculo XVI^o. Permulta latine scripta.

HISPANIA

Corpus Hispanorum de pace: Volumen de indices I - XXV. Bajo la direcció de L. Pereña (Madrid, 1987).

Gil Fernández L., "Los Austrias y el humanismo español", in Alvar A. (ed.), *Minerva Restituta. 9 Lecciones de filología clásica* (Univ. de Alcalá de Henares, 1986), pp. 161-176. De studiis classicis et imprimis latinis apud Hispanos a Carolo V ad Philippum IV († 1665).

Vosters, S.A., *Mencia de Mendoza, Vrouwe van Breda en Onderkoningin van Valencia* (Delft, Eburon, 1987). De vita et actis Menciae Mendosae (1508-1554). Complures adferuntur auctores latini, qui eam celebrarunt aut ei opera dicaverunt.

FRANCIA

Demaizière Colette, "Le trilinguisme (latin, français, dialectes) des érudits picards du XVI^e siècle", *Vita Latina*, num. 108 (Avignon, déc. 1987), 8-17.

McFarlane I.-D., "Clément Marot and the World of Neo-Latin Poetry", in Smith M.P. - McFarlane I.-D. (edd.), *Literature and the Arts in the Reign of Francis I: Essays Presented to C.A. Mayer*, French Forum Monographs, 56 (Lexington, Ky., 1985), pp. 103-130.

Prosateurs latins en France au XVI^e siècle (Paris, Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1987). Anthologia bilinguis et locupletissima (754 pp.), quam composuerunt docti viri et mulieres XIV, praefatione auxit A. Michel. Si notam praeviam (p. 23) recte intelleximus, sequetur alterum volumen auctores posterioris partis saeculi XVIⁱ colligens. In hoc libro hi insunt: Faber Stapulensis, curante G. Bedouelle (pp. 25-90); Carolus Bovillus (P. Magnard et J.-Cl. Margolin; pp. 91-156); Gulielmus Budaeus (M.-M. de la Garanderie; pp. 157-216); Stephanus Doletus (Cl. Longeon; pp. 217-256); Julius Caesar Scaliger (M. Magnien et P. Lardet; pp. 257-306); grammatici quattuor: Jac. Sylvius, Joannes Pilotus, Joannes Garnerius, Antonius Caucius (C. Demaizière; pp. 307-357); historici et artis historicae scriptores: Franc. Balduinus, Adrianus Turnebus, Joannes Auratus, Joannes Calvinus, Theodorus Beza, Joannes Bellaius, Ludovicus Regius, Arnoldus Ferronius, Petrus Paschalius (G. Demerson; pp. 358-432); philologi: Dionysius Lambinus, iterum Turnebus et Regius (J. Chomarat, qui et alia fragmenta vertit; pp. 433-494); M.-A. Muretus (P. Laurens; pp. 495-532); Petrus Ramus (P. Laurens et P. Magnard; pp. 534-570); medici: Gulielmus Copus, Andreas Laguna, Jacobus Sylvius, Michael Servetus, Joa. Fernellus (S. Bamforth et J. Dupêbe; pp. 571-665); iurisperiti: Budaeus, Andreas Alciatus, Franc. Duarenus, Carolus Du Moulin, Fr. Balduinus, Joa. de Coras, Fr. Connanus (M. Ducos; pp. 667-733).

FRANCIA: BRITANNIA MINOR

Magnien-Simonin Cathérine, *Jucquel Rougeart: Œuvres Complètes (1578)* (Paris-Genève, Droz, 1988), pp. XI-XXXI: "Approches". Breviter in conspectu ponit studiosos, litteratos et auctores Britones saeculi XVIⁱ.

ANGLIA

Carlson D., "Politicizing Tudor Court Literature: Gaguin's Embassy and Henry VII's Humanists' Response", *Studies in Philology*, 85 (1988), 279-304. In appendice eduntur poemata Rob. Gaguini, Petri Carmeliani, Joa. de Giglis.

BELGIUM VETUS (NEDERLAND-BELGIE-LUXEMBURG)

Ebels-Hoving Bunna, "Nederlandse geschiedschrijving 1350-1530. Een poging tot karakterisering", in Ebels-Hoving B., Santing C.G., Tilmans C.P.H.M., (edd.), *Genoechlicke ende lustige historiën. Laatmiddeleeuwse geschiedschrijving in Nederland* (Hilversum, Verloren, 1987), pp. 217-242. De indole et fortuna historiarum latine et vernacule apud Hollandos, Gelros et Frisios scriptarum.

Heesakkers Chr.L., "Neulateinische Geschichtsschreibung im Holländischen Humanismus des 16. Jahrhunderts", *ACNG*, pp. 201-210.

Vandermeersch, P., "Revue des travaux sur l'humanisme dans les anciens Pays-Bas de 1969 à 1986", *BHR*, 50 (1988), 125-140. Instrumentum bibliographicum criticum valde locuples.

Wittek, M., "Les filigranes du papier et l'étude des autographes d'humanistes belges", in *S.V. Br.*, pp. 135-150. Comparatur chartae aetas secundum signa aquaria (Briquet) definita et annus, quo documentum revera exaratum est. Plerumque non multum distant, interdum tamen plus decem annis (vel etiam triginta!). Scripta sunt F. Craneveldii (Orationes), Erasmi et Lipsii (Epistolae), Viglii, Busbequii, etc.

GERMANIA

Białek E. - Mrozowicz W., "Das Stammbuch des Dichters Christian Hoffmann von Hoffmannswaldau", *Daphnis*, 16 (1987), 441-456. Vota omnia latine scripta sunt annis 1633-1638. Amici illustriores sunt Nicolaus Henelius (1581-1656), historicus Silesius, et Martinus Opitius poeta (1597-1639).

Classen C.J., "Cicero orator inter Germanos redivivus", *HL*, 37 (1988), 79-114.

HELVETIA

Borle J.-P., *Le latin à l'Académie de Lausanne du XVI^e au XX^e siècle* (Lausanne, Université, 1987). Historia latinitatis Lausannensis, cui adnexa sunt aliquot operum latinorum excerpta.

HUNGARIA

Feuer-Tóth Rózsa, "Writings on the Art by Italian Humanists at King Matthias' Court Between 1474-76 and 1490", *Acta historiae artium Academiae scientiarum Hungaricae*, 32 (1986), 27-58. Tractantur Ant. Bonfinius, Franciscus Arrigonius, etc. In appendice eduntur *Averulini praefatio* Bonfini, eiusdem excerpta ex *Rerum Ungaricarum decadibus*, Arrigonii epigrammata XXIII, Franc. Bandini epistulae II.

Szörényi L., "Callimaco Esperiente e la corte di re Mattia", in *Call. Esp.*, pp. 105-118. — Id., "Neulateinische lyrische Dichtung im Ungarn des 18. Jahrhunderts und die antike Tradition", *ACNG*, pp. 153-162.

Téglásy I., "Die Anfänge der humanistischen Sprach- und Literaturtheorie in Ungarn von János Sylvester bis János Zsamboky", *WRM* 12 (1988), 96-

98. Auctor breviter contraxit quae in libro Hungarice scripto exposuit: *A humanista nyelv- és irodalomelmélet kezdetei. Sylvester Jánostól Zsamboky Jánosig* (Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988).

POLONIA

Dománski, J., "Filippo Buonaccorsi e la cultura filosofica del '400 in Polonia", in *Call. Esp.*, pp. 25-43.

Malarczyk, J., "Callimaco e il pensiero politico polacco del Quattrocento", in *Call. Esp.*, pp. 45-56.

Ślaski, J., "La fortuna dell' opera letteraria di Callimaco in Polonia", in *Call. Esp.*, pp. 73-89.

Wiesiołowski, J., "Gli amici e i mecenati di Callimaco in Polonia", in *Call. Esp.*, pp. 91-104.

Vide et infra 2.1.: Budzisz; 1.6: Malarczyk.

DANIA

Alenius Marianne & Zeeberg P. (edd.), *Litteratur og Laerdom. Dansk-svenske nylatindage April 1985*, *Renaessancestudier*, 1 (København, Museum Tusculanums Forlag, 1987).

Pade Marianne, "Danske ligtaler i det 16 århundrede", *Lit-Laer*, pp. 95-100. *Orationes funebres a Danis saeculo XVI^o habitae*.

Skaftø Jensen Mina, "Latin Bucolic Poetry in 16th Century Denmark", *ACNG*, pp. 269-276.

FENNIA

Murtorinne E., *The History of Finnish Theology 1828-1918* (Helsinki, Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1988). Usque ad medium saeculum XIX^{um} pleraque opera Latine scribebantur.

Pekkanen T. (ed.), *Ramus virens: Latinan lukemisto kouluille ja yliopistoille* (Helsinki, W. Söderström Osakeyhtiö, 1987). Florilegium, quo i.a. continentur excerpta ex Olao Magno, Andrea Burero (*Orbis Arctoi ... descriptio*, 1631), Michaelae Wexionio (*Epitome descriptionis Gothiae, Sueciae, Fennigiae*, 1650), Daniele Juslenio (*Aboa vetus et nova*, 1700), Henrico Porthan, Elia Lönnrot (*Dissertatio academica de Väinämöine priscorum Fennorum numine*, Aboae, 1827), Matthia Alexandro Castren (*Diss. ac. de affinitate declinationum in lingua Fennica, Esthonica et Lapponica*, Helsingforsiae, 1839), et Jo. Gulielmo Snellman (*De spiritus ad materiam relatione diss.*, Helsingforsiae, 1848).

Sacré, D., "Latijn uit Finland", *Kleio*, 17 (1987-1988), 6-11. De *Kalevala* latine versa a Thoma Pekkanen.

SUECIA: vide supra: Fennia (Pekkanen).

1.3. Litteraria

L'Époque de la Renaissance 1400-1600, premier volume: *L'Avènement de l'esprit nouveau (1400-1480)*. Publié sous la direction de T. Klaniczay, Eva Kushner, A. Stegmann (Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988) = *A Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages*, vol. VII. Liber hic

integrum fere decennium in typographia iacuit. Ad latinas litteras pertinent in primis capita scripta ab his auctoribus: J. Irmscher, "La nouvelle latinité et la connaissance du grec" (pp.117-125); J. Verger, "Écoles, universités, pédagogues" (pp.156-168); A. Stegmann, "Le 'test philologique' de l'homme nouveau" (pp.171-184); P. Jodogne, "La rhétorique dans la formation des intellectuels" (pp.226-236); W. Melczer, "Les encyclopédies" (pp.337-347); P. Chavy, "Les traductions humanistes" (pp.485-494); J. IJsewijn, "La poésie latine humaniste - le principe de l'imitation" (pp.495-509); A. Stäuble, "Le premier théâtre humaniste" (pp.510-518); D.R. Kelly, "Les débuts de l'historiographie humaniste" (pp.519-530); T. Klaniczay, "Le culte humaniste des grands personnages" (pp.531-545).

De Caprio V., "'Sub tanta diruta mole'. Il fascino delle rovine di Roma nel Quattro e Cinquecento", in *Poesia e Poetica delle Rovine di Roma. Momenti e Problemi*. A cura di V. De Caprio (Roma, Istit. Naz. di Studi Romani, 1987), pp.20-52. De fortuna litteraria ruinarum Romanarum earumque interpretatione morali et civili.

1.4. *Linguistica*

Rädle F., "Kampf der Grammatik. Zur Bewertung mittelalterlicher Latinität im 16. Jahrhundert", in Kindermann U., Maaz W., Wagner Fr. (edd.), *Festschrift für P. Klopsch* (Göppingen, Kümmerle, 1988), pp.424-444. Agitur de Agrippa ab Nettesheim (*De incertitudine... scientiarum*, 1550), Andrea Guarna (ca. 1470 - post 1517, *Bellum grammaticale*) et Jacobo Gretser S.J. (*Regnum Humanitatis, Dialogus*, 1587).

1.5. *Thematica*

ALBA AMICORUM: Heesakkers Chr.L., "Das Stammbuch des Janus Gruterus", *Bibliothek und Wissenschaft*, 21 (1987), 68-113. Gruterus 3 XII 1582 album inchoavit cui inscriptionem chartaceam praemisit. Album eiusque historia describitur, addito amicorum elencho; — Stoddard R.E., *Marks in Books, Illustrated and Explained* (Cambridge Mass., Harvard Univ., Houghton Library, 1985). De albis amicorum etc. — Vide etiam supra 1.2.: GERMANIA (Bialek).

"Ancients and Moderns: A Symposium", *Journal History of Ideas*, 48 (1987), 1-50. Comprehendit commentationes has: W.J. Courtenay, "Antiqui and Moderni in Late Medieval Thought" (3-10); Ch. Trinkaus, "Antiquitas versus Modernitas: An Italian Humanist Polemic and its Resonance" (11-22); H.A. Oberman, "Via Antiqua and Via Moderna: Late Medieval Prolegomena to Early Reformation Thought" (23-40); N.W. Gilbert, "Comment" (41-50).

BELLUM/PAX: Worstbrock Fr.J. (ed.), *Krieg und Frieden im Horizont des Renaissancehumanismus*, Mitteilungen der Kommission für Humanismusforschung der deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft, XIII (Weinheim, 1986).

CONSOLATIO: King Margaret L., "An Inconsolable Father and his Humanist Consolers: Jacopo Antonio Marcello, Venetian Nobleman, Patron and

- Man of Letters", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp. 221-246. Consolationes XIV supersunt in codice Glasguensi, Hunter Mus. 201. Auctores sunt XII, inter quos Philelphi duo, N. Secundinus, Georgius Trapezuntius, Isotta Nogarola, Baptista Guarinus etc.
- MERCURIUS: — *Mercure à la Renaissance*, par Cl. Balavoine e.a. Actes des Journées d'étude des 4-5 octobre 1984, Lille, publiés par M.-M. de La Garanderie. Société française des seizièmistes (S.l. [sed venum datur apud Slatkine, Geneva], 1988); — Neuhausen K.A., "De Mercurio renascentibus obvio litteris", *ACNG*, pp. 117-126.
- AUCTORES ANTIQUI:
- APULEIUS: vide infra 3.2.: Petreius; 4.2.: Erasmus (Elsom).
- AUGUSTINUS: vide infra 4.2.: Vives (Coppens).
- AUSONIUS: Schoeck R.J., "On the Editing of Classical Texts Before Vinet: Early Printed Editions of Ausonius Before 1580", *ACNG*, pp. 137-144.
- BOETHIUS: Milanese G., "Alcune utilizzazioni della *Consolatio philosophiae* nell'Umanesimo", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 221-226.
- CAESAR: vide infra 3.2.: Frischlinus; Muretus; 4.2.: Lipsius (Schrijvers); Petrarca (Blanc); Ramus (Dubois).
- CICERO: vide supra 1.2.: Germania (Classen); infra 4.2.: Inghiramus; Petrarca (Van Crombruggen).
- DICTYS CRETENSIS: Maltese E.V., "Il diario della guerra di Troia (Ditti Cretese) tra Ciriaco d'Ancona e Giorgio Gemisto Pletone", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 209-214.
- DIONYSIUS AREOPAGITA: Moffit Watts Pauline, "Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite and Three Renaissance Neoplatonists: Cusanus, Ficino & Pico on Mind and Cosmos", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp. 279-298; — Monfasani J., "Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite in Mid-Quattrocento Rome", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp. 188-219. De dubiis circa Dionysium auctorem prolatis a L. Valla, Th. Gaza et Petro Balbo, a Bessarione autem refutatis.
- HELIODORUS: vide 4.2.: Crusius.
- HANNO: Mund-Dopchie M., "Les humanistes face aux 'Gorilles' d'Hannon", in *Prose et prosateurs de la Renaissance. Mélanges R. Aulotte* (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1988), pp. 331-341.
- HIERONYMUS: vide infra 4.2.: Erasmus (Yearbook).
- HOMERUS: vide infra 2.2.: Eobanus Hessus; 4.2.: Guarinus Veronensis.
- HORATIUS: vide infra 2.2.: Buchanan; Campion.
- IAMBlichus: vide infra 4.2.: Ficinus (Copenhaver).
- IOANNES Damascenus: Backus Irena, "Traductions latines des œuvres de Jean Damascène: éditions de Cologne (1546) et de Bâle (1548). Présentation du contenu et étude des deux traductions de 'De duabus Christi voluntatibus'", *ACNG*, pp. 17-24.
- LUCIANUS: Gericke Ph.O., "Lucian's Twelfth Dialogue of the Dead in Three Fifteenth Century Versions", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 127-135; — vide et infra 4.2.: Aurispa.
- MARTIALIS: vide infra 4.2.: Perottus (Charlet-Furno).
- OVIDIUS: vide infra 4.2.: Ciofanus.
- PERSIUS: vide infra 4.2.: Politianus (Commento inedito).

- PHAEDRUS: vide infra 4.2.: Perottus (Boldrini: "Un nuovo").
- PLATO: Hankins J., "A Manuscript of Plato's Republic in the Translation of Chrysoloras and Uberto Decembrio with Annotations of Guarino Veronese (Reg. Lat. 1131)", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp. 149-188; — vide et infra 4.2.: Argyropulus.
- PLINIUS: vide infra 4.2.: Collenucius.
- PLOTINUS: vide infra 4.2.: Politianus (Wolters).
- POLYBIUS: vide infra 4.2.: Perottus (Pace).
- PROCLUS: vide infra 4.2.: Ficinus (Klutstein).
- PROPERTIUS: Tateo Fr., "Properzio nella poesia latina del Quattrocento", in *Properzio*, pp. 41-64; — vide infra 2.2.: Campion; Aeneas Sylvius.
- QUINTILIANUS: vide infra 4.2.: Perottus (Furno); Ramus (Arguments in Rhetoric).
- SENECA: Opelt Ilona, "Seneca bei den Humanisten", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 253-256. De ortu editionis omnium operum; — vide infra 4.2.: Barzizza; Polentonus.
- SYNESIUS: vide infra 4.2.: Ficinus (Copenhaver).
- TERENTIUS: vide infra 4.2.: Bembus.
- THEOGNIS: IJsewijn J., "Theognidis Sententiae a Francisco Craneveldio Latine versae (1541)", in Bonanno A. - Vella H.C.R. (edd.), *Laurea corona. Studies in Honour of Edward Coleiro* (Amsterdam, B.R. Grüner, 1987), pp. 14-22. Craneveldius usus est Adagiis Erasmi. Nota et verba novata (p. 17): *centauros crudivoros, plebivorum tyrannum*.
- VALERIUS MAXIMUS: vide infra 4.2.: Pighius.
- VERGILIUS: Bilinski Br., *La Fortuna di Virgilio in Polonia* (Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Ossolińskich, 1986); — Brown Virginia - Kallendorf Cr., "Two Humanist Annotators of Virgil: Coluccio Salutati and Giovanni Tortelli", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp. 65-148; — Closa J., "Vergilius, poeta Latinus: Virgili en els humanistes hispànics", in *Studia Virgiliana: Actes del VI^e simposi d'estudis clàssics 11-13 de Febrer de 1981*, Servei de publicacions de la universitat autònoma de Barcelona (Bellaterra, 1985), pp. 153-161; — Fisher A., "Three Meditations on the Destruction of Vergil's Statue: The Early Humanist Theory of Poetry", *RQ*, 40 (1987), 607-635. Tractantur epistolae Petri Pauli Vergerii (1397), anonymi Bononiensis (25 XII 1397) et Coluccii Salutati (23 IV 1398) de Vergili statua a Carolo Malatesta Mantuae delecta; — vide infra 2.2.: Bartholinus; Campion; Eobanus Hessus; Opitius M.; 4.2.: Guarinus Veronensis.

1.6. Scientifica

- The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*. Edited by C.B. Schmitt, Q. Skinner, E. Kessler, Jill Kraye (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988).
- Bukowska Gorgoni Cristina, "Un contributo alla storia dell'umanesimo giuridico: il manoscritto Casanatense 466", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 49-57.
- Dauphiné J., "De l'enquête cosmologique à la fin du XVII^e (sic) siècle (1560-1600)", *Bulletin de l'Association G. Budé*, 1987, 350-359.
- Filipczak-Nowicka Sabina - Grech-Zmijewska Zofia, *Lingua latina ad usum*

- medicinae studentium* (Warszawa, Państwowy Zakład wydawnictw lekarskich, 1986).
- Irmscher J., "Die Stellung der neulateinischen Studien im philologisch-historischen Wissenschaftssystem", *ACNG*, pp. 211-220.
- Kramer J., "Xenophobie als Motiv für die Einführung der antikisierenden Aussprache des griechischen im 16. Jahrhundert", *Antike und Abendland*, 34 (1988), 79-88.
- Malarczyk, J., "Bartolo da Sassoferrato ed il diritto romano in Polonia nell'epoca del Rinascimento", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 199-205.
- Mazzocco A., "Linee di sviluppo dell' Antiquaria del Rinascimento", in *Poesia e Poetica delle Rovine di Roma. Momenti e Problemi*. A cura di V. De Caprio (Roma, Ist. Naz. di Studi Romani, 1987), pp. 53-71. Brevis conspectus historiae *Antiquitatum* romanarum et, in genere, veterum a Petrarca ad saeculum XV^{um} exiens.
- Marx Barbara, "'Propositio vel inaudita et modis omnibus absurda'. Humanistische Philologie, Biblexegese und utopische Literatur", *ACNG*, pp. 641-652.
- MENCKE OTTO (1644-1707) Laeven A.H., *De "Acta Eruditorum" onder redactie van Otto Mencke (1644-1707). De geschiedenis van een internationaal geleerdenperiodiek tussen 1682 en 1707. Die "Acta Eruditorum" unter der Redaktion von Otto Mencke. Die Geschichte einer internationalen Gelehrtenzeitschrift von 1682 bis 1707. Mit einem Verzeichnis aller (bisher anonymen) Kontribuenten, einer Uebersicht der Korrespondenz des Herausgebers, einer Bibliographie und einem Namenregister* (Amsterdam - Maarsse, APA - Holland University Press, 1986).
- Vandewiele L.J., "Notariële verkoopakte van een apotheek te Gent in 1780", in *Academiae Analecta. Mededelingen Kon. Acad. Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Wetenschappen*, 49 (1988), num. 2, pp. 51-95. Editur elenchus medicamentorum circiter DC, quae praesto erant in pharmacopolio Gandavensi anno 1780. Addita est interpretatio nederlandica et explanatio brevis singulorum medicamentorum.
- Van Dievoet G., Van den Auweele D., Stevens Fr., Oosterbosch M., Coppens Chr. (edd.), *Lovanium docet. Geschiedenis van de Leuvense Rechtsfaculteit (1425-1914). Tentoonstelling, Leuven, Centrale Bibliotheek, 25 mei - 2 juli 1988* (Leuven, Universiteitsbibliotheek, 1988). Synopsis iurisperitorum Lovaniensium eorumque operum (quae ad iniens saeculum XIX omnia fere Latine scripta sunt).
- Vasoli C., "I Gesuiti e l'enciclopedismo seicentesco", in *Jesu*, pp. 491-507.
- WUTKE D., "Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis von Humanismus und Naturwissenschaft im deutschsprachigen Raum", *ACNG*, pp. 181-191.
- Vide et 1.2: Fennia (Murtorinne).

1.8. Didactica

- Gruber J., *Europäische Literatur in lateinischer Sprache. Texte und Interpretationen, Auxilia, Unterrichtshilfen für den Lateinlehrer*, 16 (Bamberg, C.C. Buchners Verlag, 1987). Proponit etiam auctores et inscriptiones recentio-

res a Francisco Petrarca ad J. Balde (immo ad aequales nostros). Libellus scholis utilissimus etiam extra Germaniam.

HUTTENUS UDALRICUS: Kössling R., "Ulrich von Hutten 21.VI.1488 - 29.VIII.1523 Ritter und Humanist", *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* (Sonderheft, 1988), 2-10.

YETZWEIRTIVS JACOBUS (Sint-Winoksbergen 1541 - post 1577): Leys Fr., "Fama poetarum nullis debilis annis: drie brieven uit de correspondentie tussen Jacobus Yetzweirtius en Jacobus Sluperius", *Didactica Classica Gandensia*, 26-27 (1986-1987), 261-295. In usum scholarum proponuntur epistolae metricae III, Yetzweirtii duo, Sluperii una. Agitur de carminibus inter se datis. Corrige mendula typographica in ep. II 14 (lege: nobiliora) et III 34 (lege: liquore).

1.9. *Ecdotica*

Grafia e interpunzione del latino nel medioevo. Seminario internazionale, Roma, 27-29 settembre 1984. A cura di A. Maierù, Lessico intellettuale europeo, XLI (Roma, Edizioni dell' Ateneo, 1987). Vide imprimis P. Tombeur, "De polygraphia" (pp. 69-102); G. Ouy, "Orthographe et ponctuation dans les manuscrits des humanistes français des XIV^e et XV^e siècles" (pp. 167-206), cuius appendix prima (pp. 182-187) tractat "La théorie de la ponctuation selon Gasparino Barzizza".

2. POETICA

2.1 *Generalia*

Budzisz A., *Epigramat łaciński w Polsce w pierwszej połowie XVI wieku. Studium analityczne* (Lublin, Catholic University, 1988). De epigrammatis latinis apud Polonos scriptis priore saeculi XVIⁱ parte. Investigatio analytica.

Campion Ennen R., "The Early History of the 'Gradus ad Parnassum'", *Archivum Histor. Societ. Iesu*, 56 (1987), 233-266. Historia a *Synonymorum et Epithetorum Thesauro* in collegio S.J. Parisiensi condito (1652) ad *Thesaurum poeticum* Ludovici M. Quicherat aliosque *Gradus* saeculi XIXⁱ.

Devoldere L., "Hedendaagse Neolatijnse Poëzie", *Streven*, 55 (Antwerpen, 1987-1988), 515-532. Quaestiones de poetis latinis nostrae aetatis variis (L. Viscido, J. Tusiani, H.C. Schnur, T. Smerdel, Anne E. Radke, F. Rädle, H. Vroom, P. Claes, H. Reinhardt) variis illustratae carminibus.

Dolla V., "Echi properziani nella cultura e nella poesia dei secoli XIII e XIV", in *Properzio*, pp. 21-40.

Hofmann H. (red.), "Seminar on Didactic Poetry", *ACNG*, pp. 401-435. Commentationes quinque, quas proposuerunt H. Hofmann, B. Effe, F. Akkerman, G. Roellenbleck, M.A. Di Cesare, moderatus est H. Hofmann.

Landwehr J., *Emblem and Fable Books, Printed in the Low Countries 1524-1813. A Bibliography* (Utrecht, Hes Publ., 1988³). 150 fere libri novi priori editioni accesserunt.

- Muñoz Simonds Peggy, "Some Images of the Conscience in Emblem Literature", *ACNG*, pp. 315-330.
- Osorio I., "El genero emblematico de Nueva España", *Omnia*, A. 3, n° 7 (México, D.F., Junio de 1987), 17-23.
- Placanica A., "Un terremoto e sedici poeti", in *De Lisio* (1987), pp. 585-640.
Tres poetae latini scripserunt de terrae motu in Calabria et Messanae facto anno 1783: Nicolaus Bardarius, Antonius Jerocades, Xaverius Rodinò.
- Reineke Ilse, *Julius Caesar Scaligers Kritik der neulateinischen Dichter. Text, Uebersetzung und Kommentar des 4. Kapitels von Buch VI seiner Poetik*, Humanistische Bibliothek, Abhandlungen, 45 (München, W. Fink Verlag, 1988).
- Rodney G. Dennis (ed.), *Poemata Humanistica Decem* (Cambridge/Mass., Harvard Univ., 1986). Poetae sunt Chr. Landinus, A. Politianus, J.J. Pontanus, J. Secundus, C. Celtis, Antonius Telesius, J. Sannazarus. Editio bilinguis.
- Smith M.C., "Latin Translations of Ronsard", *ACNG*, pp. 331-338.
- Soldati B., *La poesia astrologica nel 400*. Presentazione di Cesare Vasoli (Firenze, Casa ed. Le Lettere, 1986). Editio anastatica prioris (1906).
- Wiegand H., *Hodoeporica* (Baden-Baden, 1984; cf. *HL*, 33 [1984], 328) recensuit J. IJsewijn, *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch*, 21 (1986), 305-308.
- Vide et supra 1.1.: Oberlé; 1.2.: Italia (Füssel); Francia (McFarlane), Hungaria (Szörényi); Dania; 1.3.: L'Époque de la Renaissance; 1.5.: Propertius.

2.2. Poetae

- ABAD DIDACUS IOSEPHUS S.J.: Fernandez Valenzuela B., "Diego José Abad, poeta universal", *Nova Tellus* 4 (México, U.N.A.M., 1986), 131-146; — Kerson A.L., "Enlightened Thought in Diego José Abad's *De Deo, Deoque Homine Heroica*", *ACNG*, pp. 617-624.
- ACIDALIUS VALENS (Wittstock, 1567 - Neisse, 1595): Kytzler B., "Laudes Silesiae III. Der Sonnengesang des Acidalius", *Jahrbuch der Schlesischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Breslau*, 27 (1986), 81-86.
- AENEAS SYLVIVS: Paparelli G., "Properzio nella poesia giovanile di Enea Silvio Piccolomini", *Properzio*, pp. 65-70.
- ALCIATUS ANDREAS: *The Emblems of Andreas Alciatus*. Edited by P.M. Daly, Virginia W. Callahan and S.H. Cutler, 2 vols. (Toronto U.P., 1985) — Callahan Virginia W., "Andreas Alciatus and Boniface Amerbach: The Chronicle of a Renaissance Friendship", *ACNG*, pp. 193-200.
- ALLATIUS LEO: Gallo I., "Su due epigrammi greci di Leone Allacci", in *Miscellanea filologica*, a cura di I. Gallo, Univ. degli Studi di Salerno, Quaderni del Dip. di Scienze dell' Antichità, 1 (Salerno, 1986), pp. 193-202.
- AMMONIUS ANDREAS: Tournoy G., "The Unrecorded Poetical Production of Andreas Ammonius", *HL* 37 (1988), 255-264.
- ANONYMUS FRISIUS: Santing Catrien, "De *Sequencia sacratissimi Switberti*. Over humanisten, heiligen en geschiedschrijving in de Noordelijke Nederlanden", in Ebels-Hoving B., Santing C.G., Tilmans C.P.H.M. (edd.),

- Genoechlicke ende lustige historiën. Laatmiddeleeuwse geschiedschrijving in Nederland* (Hilversum, Verloren, 1987), pp. 157-176. Auctor huius 'Centrimetri' inediti fortasse est Fridericus Moorman Emdenus aut Theodoricus Ulsenius.
- ARRIGONIUS FRANCISCUS: vide supra 1.2.: Hungaria (Fever-Tóth).
- ARVINIANUS TORQUATIUS FEBRUARIUS GREGORIUS (Strassburg, fl. saec. XVI in.): Wuttke D., "Ist Gregorius Arvinianus identisch mit Publius Vigilantius?", in M. von Arnim (ed.), *Festschrift Otto Schäfer* (Stuttgart, Hanswedell, 1987), pp. 43-77. Arvinianus, qui anno 1505 Norimbergae oden sapphicam edidit "de divi Rochi confessoris vita etc.", revera idem esse videtur atque P.V., qui 1506-1512 Francofurti ad Viadrum eloquentiam docuit.
- BALDE JACOBUS SJ: Jacob Balde, *Odes (Lyrica), Livres I-II. Texte de l'édition commentée du P. Benno Müller, Regensburg 1884*. Traduction et Notes par Andrée Thill; *Les Odes de Jacob Balde et le mouvement baroque européen: introduction* par M. Israel (Mulhouse, Université de Haute Alsace, 1988). Liber nitidus et pulcherrimus, bonae frugis plenus, qui poetae et curatoribus insigni est honori. Utinam multi Baldeum poetam huius libri auxilio cognoscant; — Stroh W., "'An Senat und Volk von München'. Die Münchener Mariensäule und ihr Dichter Balde", *Literatur in Bayern*, num. 11 (März 1988 - Verlag W. Ludwig, D-8068 Pfaffenhofen/Ilm), 2-13. Addita est poetae vita e necrologio Neoburgensi nunc primum edita. — Vide et 1.8 (Gruber); 3.2.
- BAPTISTA MANTUANUS: vide infra: Soupherus.
- BARDARIUS NICOLAUS (Pizzoni/Vibo Val. 1717-1808): vide supra 2.1: Placanica.
- BARTHOLINUS RICCARDUS (Perugia, 1475-1529): Füssel St., *Riccardus Bartholinus Perusinus. Humanistische Panegyrik am Hofe Kaiser Maximilians I, Saecula Spiritalia*, 16 (Baden-Baden, Valentin Koerner, 1986); — Scholz Williams, Gerhild, "Vergil in Wien: Bartholinis *Austriados Libri XII* und Jakob Spiegels Kommentar", *ACNG*, pp. 171-180.
- BAUHUSIUS BERNARDUS S.J.: McGrath Elizabeth, "Rubens's *Musathena*", *Journal Warburg and Courtauld Instit.*, 50 (1987), 233-245. De icone frintispicii *Epigrammatum* (1634).
- BEZA THEODORUS: Thomson Th., "The Latin Psalm Paraphrases of Théodore de Bèze", *ACNG*, pp. 353-364.
- BISSELIUS IOHANNES S.J.; Wiegand H., "Marianische Liebeskunst: Zu den Anfängen der lateinischen Lyrik des Johannes Bisselius S.J. (1601-1682)", *ACNG*, pp. 383-394.
- BOCCACCIUS IOHANNES: Smarr Janet, *Giovanni Boccaccio: Eclogues* (New York, Garland Publishing, 1987).
- BOGHERIUS (Flexor) HENRICUS (Höxter an der Weser, ante 1450 - Rostock, ineunte 1505): Maaz W., "Henricus Boger (vor 1450-1505). Ein Beitrag zur 'Vetula'-Rezeption", in Kindermann U., Maaz W., Wagner Fr. (edd.), *Festschrift für Paul Klopsch, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik*, 492 (Göppingen, Kummerle Verlag, 1988), pp. 345-358. Describitur vita poetae praehumanistici, recensentur opera (edita atque inedita), critice editur *Elegia: de auctore libri quem De Vetula inscribunt opinio*. In v. 6 nota vocem "patefactor mysterii".

- BONONIENSIS HIERONYMUS FRANCISCUS (Treviso, 1454-1517): Pecoraro M., "Contributi biografici ed accenni letterari in due testamenti inediti di Girolamo da Bologna", in *Zaccaria*, pp. 169-188. Eduntur etiam aliquot carmina e *Promiscuorum libris* deprompta. Adde Godelieve Tournoy-Thoen, "Zwei unveröffentlichte Gedichte an Erasmus aus Girolamo Bononis *Promiscuorum libri*", *HL*, 19 (1970), 235-240.
- BRAHE TYCHO: Zeeberg P., "Kemi og kaerlighed: Naturvidenskab i Tycho Brahes latindigtning", in *Lit-Laer*, pp. 149-161. *Chemia et amor sive de Brahe poeta erotico-physico. Illustratur heroidis epistula Urania Titani*; item proponitur elenchus carminum latinorum Tychonis Brahe annis 1566-1601 scriptorum.
- BRUNO HENRICUS (Alkmaar 1620-1664): Strengholt L., "De dichter Henrick Bruno, gouverneur van Huygens' kinderen", in *Soeticheydt des buytenlevens* [vide infra: HUGENIUS], pp. 17-28.
- BUCHANANUS GEORGIUS: Watt W.S., "New Poems by Buchanan, From Portugal", *BHR*, 49 (1987), 605-606. Emendat et illustrat duo disticha primum a J. Martyn edita in *Actis Conventus Neo-Latini Sanctandreami*; — Green R., "Horace's Odes in the Psalm Paraphrases of Buchanan", *ACNG*, pp. 71-80; — Vide et sub 3.2.
- BURCKHARDUS DE HORNECK (Horneck/Heilbronn, ca. 1433/40 - Würzburg, 1522): Fischer Kl.-D., "Das Gesundheitsgedicht des Burckhard von Horneck († 1522)", *Gesnerus. Swiss Journal of the History of Medicine and Sciences*, 45 (1988), 31-48. Critice editum est carmen circa annum 1500 Memmingae typis bis impressum. Additae sunt interpretationes germanicae duae, prior editoris, altera (quae potius est paraphrasis) Joannis Pfeiffelman anno 1507 divulgata.
- BUS JOSEPHUS (Hoogstraten, 1893 - Kapellen, 1 IV 1966): Sacré D., "Gezelle in het Latijn. Enkele onuitgegeven vertalingen van Jozef Bus", *Hermeneus*, 60 (1988), 34-36. Interpretationes Latinae carminum Guidonis Gezelle, poetae flandrici.
- CABILLAVIUS BALDUINUS S.J.: Boriaud J.-Y., "Rome et les poètes jésuites latins de la Province Flandro-belge pendant la première moitié du XVII^e siècle; l'exemple de Baudouin Cabilliau et de Herman Hugo", in *Jesu*, pp. 407-415.
- CAIETANUS DANIEL: vide infra 4.2: Perottus (Charlet).
- CALENUS HENRICUS (Beringen, 1583 - Mechelen, 21 I 1653): Pletinckx L., "Het kruisdicht van Justus de Harduwijn", in Ockeley J. (ed.), *650 jaar Heilig Kruis te Asse. Situering, legende en verering* (Asse, Gemeentebestuur, 1987), pp. 221-226. Edit (p. 222) *Encomium Crucis*, elegiam a Caleno anno 1622 scriptam, cum esset pastor Ascanus. Nota vocem "serpentiger" in v. 9 (Moysis baculum est "stipes serpentiger").
- CALLIMACHUS EXPERIENS: Casarsa Laura, "La ricerca poetica di Callimaco. Redazioni e tradizione manoscritta", in *Call. Esp.*, pp. 151-168; — Castelli Patrizia, "I sogni di Callimaco", in *Call. Esp.*, pp. 57-72. Tractat *Prefacionem in somnarium Leonis Tusci philosophi* (1494); — Coppini Donatella, "Tradizione classica e umanistica nella poesia di Callimaco Esperiente", in *Call. Esp.*, pp. 119-149; — Medioli Masotti Paola, "Callimaco, l'Accade-

- mia romana e la congiura del 1468", in *Call. Esp.*, pp. 169-179; — Vasoli C., "Il pensiero religioso di Callimaco Esperiente", in *Call. Esp.*, pp. 3-23.
- CALVINUS JOANNES: De Boer E.A., *Loflied en hekeldicht. De geschiedenis van Calvijns enige gedicht. Het Epinicion Christo cantatum van 1 januari 1541* (Haarlem, Aca-Media, 1986).
- CAMPION THOMAS: Gullans Ch., "Campion, Virgil, Horace & Propertius", *Seventeenth Century News*, 46 (1988), 5-7. Agitur etiam de paraphrasi odae Horatianae I 9 ("Ad nobiliss. virum Gulielmum Percium", *Epigramm. lib. II* [1619], II 40).
- CAPILUPUS LAELIUS: Calitti Floriana, "Fatica o ingegno: Lelio Capilupi e la pratica del Centone", in Mazzacurati G.C. - Plaisance M. (edd.), *Scritture di Scritture: Testi, generi, modelli nel Rinascimento*, Europa delle Corti ..., Biblioteca del Cinquecento, 36 (Roma, Bulzoni, 1987), pp. 497-507.
- CARMELIANUS PETRUS (Brescia, 1451 - England, ca. 1528): Carlson D., "The Occasional Poetry of Pietro Carmeliano", *Aevum*, 61 (1987), 495-502. Eduntur carmina et epigrammata IX; — vide et supra 1.2.: Anglia.
- CASTIGLIONE BALTHASAR: Ryan L.V., "Baldassare Castiglione as a Latin Poet", *ACNG*, pp. 299-306.
- CELTIS CONRADUS: *Gunther der Dichter, Ligurinus*. Herausgegeben von E. Assmann (†), Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, LXIII (Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1987). Describitur pp. 2-32 editio princeps a Conrado Celti curata (1507); eduntur epistola sodalitatis Augustanae ad lectores (pp. 5-8), Celtis carmen ad Ligurinum (p. 8) et epigramma ad Joa. Rymanum bibliopolam (pp. 15-16); Angeli Rumpler, abbas Formpachensis (ca. 1460/2 - 1513) carmen in opus Ligurini de Conrado Celti mortuo; — Adel K., "Rodolphus Agricola und Conradus Celtis", *Agricola*, pp. 149-157; — Arnold Kl., "Konrad Celtis und sein Buch über Nürnberg", *ACNG*, pp. 7-16; — vide et 2.1.: Rodney.
- CHIFFELLIUS HENRICUS (Antwerpen, 1583 - Roma, post 1651?): IJsewijn J., "Chiffellius (Kieffel, van Kieffelt), Henricus", in *Nationaal Biografisch Woordenboek*, 12 (Brussel, 1987), col. 138-141.
- CHYTRAEUS NATHAN: IJsewijn J., "À propos de l'*Hodoeporicon* de Nathan Chytraeus (1567)", *Latomus*, 46 (1987), 854-855.
- COCHANOVIVS JANUS: Glomski Jacqueline, "The Role of *Imitatio* in Jan Kochanowski's *Elegiae*, *Lyriconum libellus* and *Pieśny By*", *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, N.S., 20 (1987), 34-59; — Starnawski J., "Jean Kochanowski au pays de Ronsard", *Acta Universitatis Lodzianensis. Folia litteraria*, 20 (1987), 249-270. De fortuna carminum Cochanoianorum apud Franco-gallos saec. XIX-XX.
- CONSTANTIUS ANTONIUS: vide infra 4.2.: Perottus (Charlet).
- CORNIANUS JOANNES POMPEIUS: vide infra 4.2.: Perottus (Charlet).
- CORTESIUS ALEXANDER (Roma, ca. 1460 - IV/V 1490): Viti P., "La Valdelsa e l'umanesimo: i Cortesi", in *Call. Esp.*, pp. 246-299. Eduntur epistolae duae anno 1462 scriptae, altera vernacule, altera latine (pp. 264-265).
- CORYCIANA: Pettinelli Rosenna Alhaique, "Punti di vista sull' arte nei poeti dei *Coryciana*", *La Rassegna della letteratura italiana*, 90 (1986), 41-54.

- COTURNOSSIUS GULIELMUS (Kortrijk, 1527 - Istanbul?, 8 V 1561): Van Laere J.E. - Delva An, "Quackelbeen (Quackelbenus, Coturnossius), Willem", in *Nationaal Biografisch Woordenboek*, 12 (Brussel, 1987), col. 601-604. Poeta (*Megistes Ecloga*, Vindobonae, 1552), medicus et botanicus.
- CRANEVELDIUS FRANCISCUS: vide supra 1.5: Theognis.
- CROLLIUS JOANNES CONRADUS (Oppenheim, 1678 - 30 VI 1712): *Elegiam de obitu Friderici Wilhelmi Krause* († Oppenheim, 17 VIII 1708) edidit et germanice vertit Fr. Weinziger, in S. Düll, "Oppenheimer Inschriften" [vide infra 5: Oppenheim] (p. 83).
- CRUCIUS LEVINUS (Enschede/Oudenaarde, ca. 1485 - Boeschepe? post 1548): Desmet-Goethals M.-J., *Levinus Crucius en zijn Threnodia (1548). Bijdrage tot de studie van het humanisme in de Nederlanden*. Verhandelingen Kon. Academie W.L.S.K. van België. Klasse der Letteren 47 (Brussel 1985), Nr. 116. Liber continet commentationem de vita et scriptis Crucii, epistolarum commercium ex integro editum, elegiam ad sacrosanctam Eucharistiam e codice Londinensi nunc primum editam, *Threnodiae* textum et enarrationem. Multa etiam pertinent ad Iohannem Despauterium grammaticum.
- DÉR MOUW JOANNES ANDREAS (Westervoort, 24 VII 1863 - 's-Gravenhage 8 VII 1919): *Volledig dichtwerk*, edd. H. van den Bergh, A.M. Cram-Magré, M.F. Fresco (Amsterdam, van Oorschot, 1986). Carmina latina leguntur pp. 577-602, additis interpretationibus nederlandicis et adnotatiunculis. — Fresco M., "J.A. dér Mouw", in *Klassieke Profielen: een collectie essays over classici-literatoren uit de moderne Nederlandse letterkunde met een bloemlezing uit hun werk*, samengesteld door R. van der Paardt (Alkmaar, De Doelenpers, 1988), pp. 52-70, Proponitur i.a. carmen Graecum et alterum Latinum (pp. 58-60).
- DESBILLONS FRANCISCUS JOSEPHUS S.J. († Mannheim, 1789): Schibel W. - Wiegand H., "Gegenauklärung im lateinischen Lehrgedicht: Desbillons' 'Monita philosophica'", in Maag G. (ed.), *Ein antiphilosophisches Experiment im 18. Jahrhundert: F.-J. Terrasse Desbillons = MANA: Mannheimer Analytica / Mannheim Analytiques* 5/1986, pp. 86-103 et 194-254. Altera pars commentationis est interpretatio germanica carminis iambici, quod primum et solum typis editum est Mannhemii 1792 (*Miscellanea Posthuma*, pp. 83-144).
- DOMA PIBO (Frisia, saec. XVII): van Tuinen S. en P., "Pibo van Doma kontra prins Willem Freark - Beskriuwing fan in polityk konflikt yn 1664", *It beaken*, 49 (1987), 79-104. In appendicibus enumeratur magna pars operum Domae Latinorum et eduntur carmina duo, alterum Neuhusii, alterum Domae.
- EOBANUS HESSUS: Speyer W., "Ein unbekanntes Epigramm des Eobanus Hessus auf Vergil und Homer", in Dummer J., Irmscher J., Paschke F., Treu K. (edd.), *Texte und Textkritik: eine Aufsatzsammlung*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 133 (Berlin, DDR, Akad., 1987), pp. 553-555; — Vredeveld H., "The *Bucolicon* of Eobanus Hessus: Three Versions of Pastoral", *ACNG*, pp. 375-382.

- ERASMUS DESIDERIUS: Vredeveld H., "Towards a Definitive Edition of Erasmus' Poetry", *HL*, 37 (1988), 115-174.
- EURICIUS CORDUS: Schmidt P.G., "Euricius Cordus", *ACNG*, pp. 307-314.
- FLEMING PAULUS (1609-1640): Schubert D. (Red.), *Paul Fleming. Werk und Wirkung. Wissenschaftliches Kolloquium anlässlich des 375. Geburtstages des Dichters am 5. Oktober 1984 auf Schloss Stein in Hartenstein/Erzgebirge* (Zwickau, Pädagogische Hochschule "Ernst Schneller", 1986).
- FLEXOR: vide supra: Bogherius.
- FRACASTORIUS HIERONYMUS: Hofmann H., "Aspetti narrativi ed unità epica della *Sifilide* di Gerolamo Fracastoro", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 169-174.
- FRANCISCUS (FRANSEN) JOANNES RIPENSIS († 1584): Skaftø Jensen Minna, "Humanist Friendship in 16th Century Denmark", in *Jacobsen*, pp. 185-201. Tractantur poetae et amici Franciscus et Sadolinus.
- GAGUINUS ROBERTUS: vide supra 1.2.: Anglia.
- GAMBARA LAURENTIUS: Demerson Geneviève, "Le paysage dans l'épopée colombienne de Lorenzo Gambara (*De navigatione Ch. Columbī*)", in *Le paysage à la Renaissance, Études réunies et publiées par Y. Giraud* (Éditions universitaires Fribourg/Suisse, 1988), pp. 169-179.
- GEORGIUS (GIORGI) IGNATIUS (Dubrovnik/Ragusa, 1673/1737): Paratore E., "Ignazio Giorgi poeta latino", in Mastrocinque A. (ed.), *Omaggio a Piero Treves*, Univ. di Venezia, Fac. di Lett. e Filos., S. Sebastiano, 7 (Padova, 1983), pp. 283-294.
- GÓMEZ DE CASTRO ALVARUS (Alcalá de Henares, saec. XVI): Alvar Ezquerro A., "Alvar Gómez de Castro, humanista", *Revista de filología española*, 62 (1982), 193-210.
- GRUTERUS JANUS: vide supra 1.5.: Heesakkers.
- HARDERUS HENRICUS: vide infra 4.2.: Morus (Petersen).
- HEINSIUS DABIEL: Białek E. - Mrozowicz W., "Die Eintragungen des Daniel Heinsius in den Stammbüchern der Universitätsbibliothek Wrocław (1601-1651)", *Lias*, 13 (1986), 151-164; — Sacré D., "Heinsius' *De contemptu mortis*", *De Zeventiende Eeuw*, 4 (1988), 31-50. — vide 3.1: Sellin; 4.2.
- HONDIUS PETRUS (Vlissingen, 1578? - Terneuzen, 1621): De Smet R., "Two Unpublished Latin Elegies Written by Petrus Hondius on the Death of Marnix van Sint-Aldegonde", *Lias*, 13 (1986), 99-106.
- HORSTANUS ALBERTUS: vide infra 4.2.: Longolius.
- HUGENIUS (HUYGENS) CONSTANTINUS: Sacré D., "De metrick in de Neolatijnse poëzie van Huygens", *De Zeventiende Eeuw*, 3 (1987), 79-98. Commentatio de arte metrica Hugēnii ('versus Hugēniani non unum exemplum antiquum sequuntur, sed varia miscent'); item adnotatiunculae de lingua poetica (verba novata: carminifex, ventifer, vegrandiloquentia, papicola...). — C. Huygens, *Soeticheydt des buyten-levens: leven en leren op Hofwijck*, ed. V. Freijser (Delft, 1988). Continet pp. 7-16: Chr.L. Heesakkers, "Biografie en autobiografie: Christiaan en Constantijn Huygens over hun kinderen en Constantijn over zichzelf"; pp. 29-42: A. Eyffinger, "Voor haar doel Poeets genoegh: de klassieke vorming van Constantijn Huygens en zijn kinderen". — vide et 4.2.

- HUGO HERMANNUS S.J.: vide supra: Cabillavius.
- HUTTENUS UDALRICUS: Jillings J., "The Eagle and the Frog: Hutten's Polemic Against Venice", *Renaissance Studies*, 2 (1988), 14-26; — vide et supra 1.8.
- IRIARTE, JOANNES DE: Soons A., "Le *De Matriti sordibus* de Juan de Iriarte (1702-1771) et les courants d'idées de son époque", *ACNG*, pp. 339-352.
- JEROCADUS ANTONIUS (Parghelia, 1738-1805): vide supra 2.1.: Placanica.
- LANDINUS CHRISTOPHORUS: Lentzen M., "Le lodi di Firenze di C. Landino", *Romanische Forschungen*, 97 (1985), 36-46. — vide et 2.1. Rodney.
- LEIBNITIUS: vide infra 4.2.
- LEMNIUS SIMON: *Amorum Libri IV. Liebeselegieen in Vier Büchern*. Herausgegeben und übersetzt von L. Mundt. Bibliotheca Neolatina, 2 (Bern - Frankfurt/M. - New York - Paris, P. Lang, 1988).
- LILIUS (LILY) GULIELMUS (ca. 1468-1522): Tournoy G., "La poésie de William Lily pour le diptyque de Quentin Metsys", *Moreana*, 25, num. 97 (1988), 63-66.
- LILIUS (DE GIGLIS) JOANNES: vide supra 1.2.: Anglia.
- LUDER PETRUS: Kettemann R., "Ein früher Preis Heidelbergs und seiner Universität. Peter Luders *Laudatio* aus dem Jahre 1458", *Ruperto-Carola. Heidelberger Universitätshefte*, 38, num. 75 (Oktober 1986), 76-86; — Sottili A., "Peter Luders medizinische Promotion", *WRM*, 11 (1987), 118. Promotus est Patavii die 2^a Junii 1464.
- VON MANDELS(CH)O ANDREAS: vide infra 4.2.: Longolius.
- MELANCHTHON PHILIPPUS: vide infra 4.2.: Longolius.
- MELISSUS PAULUS: vide infra 4.2.: Lipsius: *Epistolae* (num. 742).
- MEYCHEL JOACHIMUS (Braunau, 1590-1637): Reinhardt H., "Memoria Ioachimi Meychel opportune colitur", *Hermes Americanus*, 5 (1987), 128-144, Meychel edidit *Templa Frisingensia*, epigrammatum nempe congeriem.
- MICYLLUS JACOBUS (Strassburg, 6 IV 1503 - Heidelberg, 28 I 1558): vide infra 4.2.: Morata (Holzberg).
- MOORMAN FRIDERICUS: vide supra: Anonymus Frisius.
- MORATA OLYMPIA (Ferrara, 1526 - Heidelberg, 26 X 1555): Cignoni M., "Il pensiero di Olimpia Morato nell'ambito della Riforma protestante", *Atti dell'Accademia delle scienze di Ferrara*, 60-61 (1982-84), 191-204; — vide et sub 4.2.
- MORUS THOMAS: Grace D., "Subjects or Citizens? *Populi* and *Cives* in More's *Epigrammata*", *Moreana*, 25, num. 97 (1988), 133-136; — Bek Lise, "Thomas More on the Double Portrait of Erasmus and Pierre Gillis: Humanist Rhetoric or Renaissance Art Theory?", *ACNG*, pp. 469-480; — vide et 4.2.
- MURETUS MARCUS ANTONIUS: Sabbadini E., "Un umanista francese alla corte di Ippolito II d'Este: Marc-Antoine Muret", *Atti e Memorie della Società Tiburtina di storia ed arte*, 60 (1988), 141-165; — Ginsberg Ellen S., "Marc-Antoine de Muret: a Re-Evaluation", *ACNG*, pp. 63-70; — vide et 3.2.
- MUSSATUS ALBERTINUS: Gianola Giovanna M., "Le 'divinae personae' nell'epica del primo Trecento: Albertino Mussato, Pace da Ferrara (e Dante)", in *Zaccaria*, pp. 65-88; — Pastore Stocchi M., "Il 'Somnium' di Albertino

- Mussato", in *Zaccaria*, pp.41-63. Editio critica carminis anno 1319 exeunte scripti.
- NAOGEORGUS THOMAS: Roloff H.-G., "Thomas Naogeorgs Satiren", *Daphnis*, 16 (1987), 363-385; — Id., "Zu Thomas Naogeorgs Satiren", *ACNG*, pp.127-136.
- NEUHUSIUS: vide supra: Doma.
- NOVÁK JANUS: Stroh W., "Jan Novák, Musiker und Lateiner", in *Musik in Antike und Neuzeit*, edd. von Albrecht M. - Schubert W., Quellen und Studien zur Musikgeschichte von der Antike bis in die Gegenwart, 1 (Frankfurt/M., Bern, New York, P. Lang, 1987), pp.249-253.
- OPITIUS MARTINUS: Jakobi R., "Multa dies - Ein Gedicht von Opitz?", *Euphoriion*, 81 (1987), 426. Carmen 70 editionis criticae (Bd. II, 2, 522) non est Opitianum, verum fragmentum Vergilianum (*Aen.* XI 425-7); — vide et supra 1.2.: Germania: Białek E.
- PACE DA FERRARA (saec. XIV): vide supra: Mussatus (Gianola).
- PALEARIUS AONIUS: Sacré Th., "De Aonio Paleario Verulano (1504-1570) Lucreti imitatore", *Latinitas*, 36 (1988), 45-56; — Id., "Hendecasyllabi saeculi XVIⁱ inediti nominique Aoni Paleari fortassis addicendi", *Giornale filologico ferrarese*, 10 (1987), 195-200.
- PALINGENIUS STELLATUS MARCELLUS: Moreschini Cl., "Motivi della filosofia antica nello *Zodiacus Vitae* di Marcello Palingenio Stellato", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 235-242.
- PALLADIUS DOMITIUS: vide infra 4.2.: Perottus (Charlet).
- PARMENIUS STEPHANUS: Young R.V., "'O my America, my new-found land': Pornography and Imperial Politics in Donne's Elegies", *South Central Review*, 4 (1987), 35-48. Comparat J. Donne (*Loves Progress*) et Parmenii *De Navigatione Humphri Gilberti carmen* (1582).
- PASCOLI JOANNES: Perugi M., "Veianus Hoeufftianus", *Studi di filologia italiana*, 43 (1985), 301-341.
- PASQUILLUS: Reynolds Anne, "Classical Iconography in the Early Celebrations of the Festival of Pasquino", *Parergon. Bulletin Australian and New Zealand Assoc. Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, N.S., 5 (Sydney, 1987), 117-129.
- PEROTTUS NICOLAUS: Luciani A.G., "Gli epigrammi del Perotti", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 183-198; — vide et infra 4.2.
- PETRARCA FRANCISCUS: Cipriani G., "Petrarca, Annibale e il simbolismo dell'occhio", *Quaderni Petrarqueschi*, 4 (1987), 167-184; — Cordié C., "Madame de Staël e il 'breve pangerycum defuncte matri'", *Quaderni Petrarqueschi*, 4 (1987), 331-334; — Dutschke D., *Census of Petrarch Manuscripts in the United States*, Censimento dei codici petrarcheschi, 9 (Padova, Antenore, 1986); — Feo M., "Primo dossier sul Petrarca di Gotha", (estratto da) *Quaderni Petrarqueschi*, 4 (1987). Continet 1) epistolas metricas Rinaldi Veronensis et Petrarcae, quas M. Feo Gothae reperit, addita interpretatione italica; 2) M. Feo, "Petrarca prima della laurea. Una corrispondenza poetica ritrovata" (pp.36-50); 3) Id., "I nuovi versi del Petrarca" (pp.51-62); 4) H. Hilg - M. Feo, "Primo elenco dei libri di Albrecht von Eyb" (pp.63-65); 5) V. Di Benedetto, "Osservazioni sulla

- prima lettera del Petrarca a Rinaldo Cavalchini" (pp. 67-71); 6) Interviste; L'eco della stampa; due pittori per Petrarca; — Giannarelli Elena, "Cicerone, Virgilio e l'ombra di Scipione: una sosta nell' officina poetica del Petrarca", *Quaderni Petrarqueschi*, 4 (1987), 205-227; — Minicucci Angela, "De Piceno apud Franciscum Petrarcham", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 227-231; — Zamponi S., *I mss. petrarcheschi della biblioteca civica di Trieste. Storia e catalogo* (Padova, Antenore, 1984).
- PHILOMUSUS JOANNES FRANCISCUS: vide infra 4.2.: Perottus (Charlet).
- PHILOXENUS MARCUS: vide infra 4.2.: Perottus (Charlet).
- POLITIANUS ANGELUS: Galand Perrine, "Le paysage dans les *Silves* de Politien, ou la rhétorique de l'âge d'or", in *Le paysage à la Renaissance. Études réunies et publiées par Y. Giraud* (Éditions universitaires Fribourg/Suisse, 1988), pp. 181-194; — Wallner G., "Quomodo Politianus morborum signa poetice descriperit", *Latinitas*, 35 (1987), 176-183; — Galand Perrine, "L'élégie à Lalagé ou le travail d'Esculape", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 155-165. De elegia X^a. — vide et 2.1.: Rodney.
- PONTANUS JOANNES JOVIANUS: Schrader L., "Diversité des fonctions de Mercure: l'exemple de Pontanus", in *Mercure à la Renaissance* [vide 1.5: MERCURIUS], pp. 45-54.
- PONTICUS: vide infra 4.2.: Perottus (Charlet).
- POSTHIUS JOANNES (Germersheim, 15 X 1537 - Mosbach, 24 VI 1597): Karrer Kl., "Ut amoris, ac observantiae aliquod extaret testimonium. Untersuchungen zum Selbstverständnis neulateinischen Dichtens am Beispiel des Johannes Posthius (1537-1597)", in Kindermann U., Maaz W., Wagner Fr. (edd.), *Festschrift für P. Klopsch* (Göppingen, Kümmerle Verlag, 1988), pp. 144-174.
- PRASCHIIUS JOANNES LUDOVICUS: Kelly W.A., "A Hitherto Unnoticed Poem by J.L. Prash", *WBN*, 14 (1987), 134-135. Editur e libro c.t. *Dissertatio politica... quam subjicit G.P. Dreherus* (Regensburg), 1671, Elegia moralis et congratulatoria; in v. 5 legas "statuit".
- RESENDIUS LUCIUS ANGELUS ANDREAS († Evora, 9 XII 1573): Martyn J., "The Relationship between Lúcio Ângelo André de Resende and Iohannes Secundus", *HL*, 37 (1988), 244-254; — Id., "A Renaissance Picnic at Resende's Quinta", *Portuguese Studies*, 3 (1987), 70-76. — vide et 4.2.
- RIMBAUD ARTHUR: Sacré Th., "De Arturo Rimbaldio versificatore Latino", *Melissa*, num. 24 (Bruxellis 1988), 10-12. Carmina a. 1868-1870 scripta.
- RINALDUS VERONENSIS: vide supra: Petrarca (Feo).
- RODINÒ XAVERIUS (Polistena, saec. XVIII): vide supra 2.1.: Placanica.
- ROUGEART IUDICELLUS (Plouhinec, 1558 - Quimper, 13 V 1588): Jucquel Rougeart, *Œuvres complètes* (1578). Édition critique par Cathérine Magnien-Simonin. Textes littéraires français (Paris-Genève, Droz, 1988). Poeta Brito bilinguis, cuius opera maiore ex parte nuper in bibliotheca Cadomensi reperta sunt. Latina sunt haec: (1) *Curiosolarum de haereticis Triumphus* (Parisiis 1578), carmen heroicum de urbe Concarneau capta mense jan. 1577; (2) *Divers poems Latins et françois* (P., 1578), i.e. carmina elegiaca, epigrammata et carmen de origine Britanniae. Editioni

- praemissa est commentatio de litteris apud Britones saeculi XVI¹, vita poetae et carminum enarratio; textus notis copiosis illustrantur.
- ROVIDIUS CAESAR (fl. Mediolani, ca. 1565): Pasqualetti O., "Il poeta latino Cesare Rovidio, umanista milanese", in Id., *Gemina Musa* (Piediripa di Macerata, Tipografia Biemmegraf, 1987), pp. 421-438.
- RUIZIUS VILLEGAS FERNANDUS, Burgensis (fl. 1550/70): Alcina Rovira J.-F., "Petrarquismo latino en España: Hernán Ruiz de Villegas y la imitación de Marulo", *Nova Tellus*, 4 (Mexico, U.N.A.M., 1986), 43-62.
- RUMPLER ANGELUS: vide supra: Celtis Conradus.
- SADOLINUS JOANNES GEORGII F. (fl. saec. XVI in Dania): Skafte Jensen Minna, "Hans Jørgensen Sadolins Lyrik", in *Lit-Laer*, pp. 129-137. Poeta Horatianus apud Danos per alteram saeculi XVI partem; — vide et supra: Franciscus.
- SANCTIUS BROCENSIS FRANCISCUS: Francisco Sanchez de las Brozas, *Obras*, II: *Poesía*. Edición, traducción y notas por Avelina Carrera de la Red (Caceres, Institucion cultural "El Brocense", 1985). In hoc corpus egregia cura collecta sunt omnia Brocensis carmina (cum sua tum versa) sive Latine sive Hispanice sive etiam Graece scripta et plurimis in locis sparsa. Praemissa est commentatio copiosa de editorum fontibus, de poesi Brocensis necnon poetis apud Hispanos neolatinis.
- SANNAZARIUS JACOBUS: Lieberg G., "De necessitudinibus, quae Sannazario cum poetis veteribus, imprimis Propertio, intercedunt", *Vita Latina*, num. 108 (Avignon, dec. 1987), 18-24; — Vecce C., *Iacopo Sannazaro in Francia. Scoperte di codici all'inizio del XVI secolo*, Medioevo e Umanesimo, 69 (Padova, Antenore, 1988); — vide et 2.1.: Rodney.
- SANTAMARIA PASCHALIS (Napoli, 1 III 1835 - 13 I 1918): Parisella I., "De Paschalis Santamaria nondum in lucem editis Latinis carminibus in Deiparae Mariae memoriam et honorem", *Latinitas*, 36 (1988), 127-138. Exhibentur aliquot specimina.
- SARBEVIUS MATHIAS CASIMIRUS S.J.: Starnawski J., "Quelques remarques concernant Horatius Sarmaticus, Mathias Casimirus Sarbiewski", in Bonanno A. - Vella H.C.R. (edd.), *Laurea Corona. Studies in Honour of Edward Coleiro* (Amsterdam, B.R. Grüner, 1987), pp. 216-220; — Józef Warszawski T.J., "Dramat Rzymski" *Macieja Kazimierza Sarbiewskiego TJ (1622-25)*. *Studium Literacko-biograficzne* (Roma, Typis Pontificiae Univers. Gregorianae, 1984). Liber non petendus est ab Universitate Gregoriana, sed ab ipso auctore apud *Acta Romana*, Borgo S. Spirito 5, I-00195 Roma. Adest summarium anglicum (pp. 353-356). Prima libri parte singuli fere dies describuntur primorum duorum mensium, quos Sarbievius Romae egit. Hac in parte auctor usus est documentis ineditis; dein supremum Sarbievii tempus Romanum indagatur et causa profectio-nis praematurae: invidia Urbani VIII poetae.
- SECTANUS QUINTUS (SERGARDI LUDOVICO): Citroni Marchetta Sandra, "Una satira secentesca contro gli ebrei e il 'frammento Oxoniense' di Giovenale", *Maia*, 29-30 (1977-1978), 61-68. Fortasse Sectanus versus Iuvenalinos satirae VI^{ae} anno 1899 Oxonii in codice Bodleiano primum repertos novit et in satira XIV^a imitatus est.

- SECUNDUS JOANNES: Godman P., "Johannes Secundus and Renaissance Latin Poetry", *The Review of English Studies*, 39 (1988), 258-272. Conspectus criticus operum doctorum recens editorum; — vide et supra: Resendius; item 2.1.: Rodney.
- SERRANUS LUPUS (Evora, ca. 1510/14 - Lisboa? a.1581 exeunte?): *Lopo Serrão e o sue poema Da Velhice*. Estudio introdutorio, texto latino e aparato critico, tradução e notas (de) S. Travares de Pinho, Textos humanísticos portugueses, 4 (Universidade de Coimbra, Centro de Estudos Clássicos, 1987). Editur, vertitur, illustratur fontium indagatione et notis uberrimis elegantissimum carmen *De Senectute et aliis utriusque sexus aetatibus et moribus* libris XIV comprehensum, item minora carmina *Iuxta flumina Babylonis* et *Cum exiret Israel de Aegypto*. Omnia primum in lucem prodire Olyssipone anno 1579.
- SLUPERIUS JACOBUS: vide supra 1.8.: Yetzweirtius.
- SOPHERUS GERVASIUS (Breisach, ca. 1490 - Strassburg, 1556): Jackson-Holberg Christine, "The Editio Princeps of the *Carmen de bello Saxonico*", in Kindermann U., Maaz W., Wagner Fr. (edd.), *Festschrift für P. Klopsch* (Göppingen, Kümmerle Verlag, 1988), pp.128-143. Carmen edidit Soupherus (1508), praemissis epigrammate (*liber de se*) et epistola dedicatoria; adest etiam epistola Beati Rhenani ad Wimphelingium de carmine Baptistae Mantuani.
- STIERNHIELM GEORGIUS (1598-1672): Bergh B., "Att kriga med latinsk vers", in *Lit-Laer*, pp.116-120. De epigrammate anagrammatico adversus Danos (anno 1644).
- STROZZA TITUS VESPASIANUS: Ziolkowski J., "Tito Vespasiano Strozzi's *Ad psyttacum*: a Renaissance Latin poet parrots the past", *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 35 (1987), 139-149.
- SURIGONUS STEPHANUS: Cappelle R., "De Stephano Surigono poeta", *Melissa*, num. 21 (Bruxellis 1987), 11-12.
- TRELIUS JACOBUS: vide infra 4.2.: Longolius.
- TRIPS FRANCISCUS XAVERIUS: vide infra 4.2.
- TURNERUS GULIELMUS: vide infra 4.2.: Longolius.
- ULSENIUS THEODORICUS (Zwolle, ca. 1460 - 's Hertogenbosch, I 1508): Santing C.G., "Theodoricus Ulsenius, alter Agricola? The Popularity of Agricola with Early Dutch Humanists", *Agricola*, pp.170-180.
- VALLA LAURENTIUS: Lo Monaco F., "Per un' edizione dei 'Carmina' di Lorenzo Valla", *IMU*, 29 (1986), 139-164; — vide et 4.2.
- VEGIUS MAPHAeus: Dessi Fulgheri A., "Eloquenza e arte oratoria nei discorsi del 'Libro XIII dell'Eneide' di Maffeo Vegio", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 111-124; — Supplementum criticum ad textum *Aeneidos* libri XIII¹, quem edidit B. Schneider (Weinheim, 1985), dedit G. Berger, *WRM* 12 (1988), 65-67.
- VIDA MARCUS HIERONYMUS: Di Cesare M.A., "The *Scacchia Ludus* of Marco Girolamo Vida: the Didactic Poem as Fictional Text", *ACNG*, pp.425-432.
- VIGILANTIUS PUBLIUS: vide supra: Arvinianus.
- YETZWEIRTIUS JACOBUS (Sint-Winoksbergen, 1541 - Gent?, post 1577): Leys

Fr., "Note sur la biographie de Jacques Yetzweirt", *HL*, 37 (1988), 269-271; — Id., "Yetzweirtius (Yetzweirt) Jacobus", in *Nationaal Biografisch Woordenboek*, 12 (Brussel, 1987), col. 843-848; — vide et supra 1.8.: Yetzweirtius.

3. SCAENICA

3.1. Generalia

- Briesemeister D., "Le théâtre scolaire des jésuites et les découvertes. La *Tragicomedia del Rey Dom Manoell*", in *JESU*, pp. 431-441.
- Galli Q., "Il teatro nel Quattrocento: verso la scena moderna", in *De Lisio* (1987), pp. 188-212. Tractantur imprimis *Philogenia* Ugolini Pisani (1437) et *Chrysis* Aeneae Sylvii (1444).
- Parente J.A., *Religious Drama and the Humanist Tradition. Christian Theater in Germany and in the Netherlands 1500-1680*, Studies in the History of Christian Thought, 39 (Leiden, Brill, 1987). Liber constat quattuor capitibus, quorum I^{um} ("The Nature of Humanist Religious Drama: Classical Imitation and Reform") et II^{um} ("Theology and Morality on the Humanist Stage") studiis neolatinis maximo erit usui. Tertium tractat *Iustum Vondellium*, tragoedum Batavum, quartum autem *Andrean Gryphium Silesium*.
- Rädle F., "Lateinisches Theater fürs Volk. Zum problem des frühen Jesuiten-dramas", in Raible W. (ed.), *Zwischen Festtag und Alltag. Zehn Beiträge zum Thema "Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit"* (Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, 1988), pp. 133-147.
- Reisdoerfer J., "Deux 'periochae' du manuscrit 199 de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Luxembourg. À propos du théâtre des Jésuites à Luxembourg", *Hemecht*, 38 (1986), 225-247.
- Sellin P.R., "The Proper Translation of *constitutio* in Daniel Heinsius' *De tragoediae constitutione* and Some Implications of the Word for Seventeenth-Century Literary Theory", *ACNG*, pp. 541-550.
- Sprengel, P., "Der Spieler-Zuschauer im Jesuitentheater. Beobachtungen an frühen oberdeutschen Ordensdramen", *Daphnis*, 16 (1987), 47-106.
- Weber Edith, "Le théâtre humaniste protestant à participation musicale et le théâtre jésuite: influences, convergences, divergences", in *JESU*, pp. 445-460.
- Vide et supra 1.3.: *L'Époque de la Renaissance*.

3.2. Scriptores scaenici

AENEAS SYLVIVS: vide supra 3.1.: Galli.

ALABASTER GULIELMUS (Hadleigh, Suffolk, 1568 - London, 1640): Thomas Watson, *Antigone*; William Alabaster, *Roxana*; Peter Mease, *Adrastus parentans sive Vindicta*. Prepared with an Introduction by J.C. Coldewey and Br. F. Copenhaver, *Renaissance Latin Drama in England*, II 4 (Hildesheim, Zürich, New York, G. Olms, 1987). Editio phototypica exemplaris Londiniensis 1632.

- ANONYMUS CANTABRIGIENSIS (ca. 1611/13 in Collegio S. Trinitatis): *Cancer...* Prepared with an Introduction by Th. W. Best, Renaissance Latin Drama in England, II 2 (Hildesheim, Zürich, New York, G. Olms, 1987), pp. 1-11 et editio phototypica editionis Londiniensis 1648.
- ANONYMUS FLANDER: Wittouck H., *Een meertalig Brugs vastenavondspel uit de zestiende eeuw*. Uitgave, vertaling en commentaar (Lic. diss. K.U.Leuven, 1988). Editio princeps ludi trilinguis (latine, flandrice, francogallice) saeculi XVIⁱ, cuius in prologo *Laus Stultitiae* erasmiana manifesto in memoriam revocatur.
- AUCTOR POLONUS S.J.: Starnawsky J., "Ein Unbekanntes Jesuitendrama über Ioannes Dantiscus aus dem 18. Jahrhundert", *ACNG*, pp. 145-152.
- BALDE JACOBUS S.J.: Leonhardt J., "Philologie in Baldes *Drama Georgicum*", in *Res publica litteraria. Die Institutionen der Gelehrsamkeit in der frühen Neuzeit* (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1987), pp. 475-484; — vide et 2.2.
- BRILLMACHER PETRUS MICHAELIS S.J. (1542-1595): Michel W., "Das Jesuitendrama *Daniel* von 1565 in Mainz", *Mainzer Zeitschrift*, 82 (1987), 123-149. Editio princeps e codice Confluentino (Landeshauptarchiv Koblenz, Best. 117 num. 728), interpretatio germanica et introductio de auctore, qui esse videtur Petrus Michaelis. In v. 59 lege "alicuius".
- BRUNI LEONARDUS: vide infra: Serrata.
- BUCHANANUS GEORGIUS: Akkerman F., "Jepta bij Buchanan en Vondel. Van vroeg-klassiek naar laat-barok", *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde*, 103 (Leiden, 1987), 279-289; — Wall J., "The Dramaturgy of Buchanan's Tragedies", *ACNG*, pp. 163-170; — vide et 2.2.
- CORNAZZANUS ANTONIUS: De Paolis P., "Note al testo della *Fraudiphila* attribuita ad Antonio Cornazzano", in *Studi per Ricc. Ribuoli...* a cura di Fr. Piperno (Roma, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1986), pp. 27-35.
- FRISCHLINUS NICODEMUS: Ridé J., "César, héros d'une comédie humaniste: *Julius Redivivus* de Nicodemus Frischlin", in *César*, pp. 231-238; — Rädle F., "Einige Bemerkungen zu Frischlins Dramatik", *ACNG*, pp. 289-298.
- GRETSEY JACOBUS S.J.: vide supra 1.4.: Rädle.
- GROTIUS HUGO: Eyffinger A., "Grotius' Drama on Joseph in Egypt in the Tradition of the Theme", *ACNG*, pp. 261-268.
- GUALTHERUS RUDOLFUS (Zürich, 1519 - 25 XII 1586); Witkowska Maria, *Das neulateinische Schuldrama "Nabal" von Rudolf Gwalther und seine deutsche Fassungen*, Zürcher Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte, 13 (Frankfurt/M., Bern, New York, Paris, P. Lang, 1987). Studium litterarium comparativum.
- HAWKESWORTH GUALTERUS (ca. 1573-74 - Madrid, IX 1606): Walter Hawkesworth, *Leander: Labyrinthus*. Prepared with an Introduction by Susan Brock, Renaissance Latin Drama in England, II 3 (Hildesheim, Zürich, New York, G. Olms, 1987). Editiones phototypicae (*Leandri codex Cantabrig.* Trin. R.3.9; *Labyrinthi* editio 1636).
- HEINSIUS DANIEL: vide 3.1.: Sellin.
- MACROPEDIUS GEORGIUS: Leys Fr., "L'Hecastus' de Macropedius et le 'Landjuweel' de Gand (1539)", *HL*, 37 (1988), 267-268; — Puttiger H.P.M.,

- Georgius' Macropedius' Asotus. Een neolatijns drama over de verloren zoon door Joris van Lanckvelt*. Diss. Nijmegen (Nieuwkoop, De Graaf, 1988). Editio et interpretatio nederlandica, commentatio litteraria et linguistica.
- MASENIUS JACOBUS (Jülich, 23 III 1606 - Trier, 27 IX 1681): Halbig C.M., *The Jesuit Theater of Jacob Masen. Three Plays in Translation With an Introduction*, American University Studies, Ser. XVII, 1 (Frankfurt/M., Bern, New York, Paris, P. Lang, 1987). Versio anglica *Androphili* tragico-comoediae, *Rustici Imperantis* comoediae historicae et *Mauritii* tragoediae. Desiderantur textus primigenii latini. In introductione nomen collegii Coloniensis corrigatur: *Tricoronatum*, non *Tricornatum*.
- MEASE PETRUS: vide supra: Alabaster.
- MURETUS MARCUS ANTONIUS: La Penna A., "La non gloriosa entrata di Cesare nella tragedia moderna", in *César*, pp. 157-167; — Pineaux J., "César dans la tragédie humaniste de la Renaissance française", in *César*, pp. 213-222; — vide et 2.2.
- MUSSATUS ALBERTINUS: Müller H., *Früher Humanismus in Oberitalien: Albertino Mussato, Ezerinis*, Studien zur klassischen Philologie, 31 (Frankfurt/M., Bern, New York, Paris, P. Lang, 1987). Editio adnotata, interpretatio germanica, commentatio de auctore eiusque tragoedia.
- NAOGEORGUS THOMAS: *Sämtliche Werke*, herausgegeben von H.-G. Roloff, 4. Bd, 1-2: *Dramen V und VI, Hieremias - Iudas Iscariotes, mit zeitgenössischen Uebersetzungen* (Berlin, New York, De Gruyter, 1987).
- PETREIUS (PEREZ) JOANNES (Toledo, 1511 - Alcalá de Henares, 1544): Alvar Ezquerra A., "Juan Pérez (Petreius) y el teatro humanístico", in *Unidad y Pluralidad en el mundo antiguo. Actas del VI Congreso español de Estudios clásicos* (Madrid, 1983), pp. 205-212. Compluti scripsit comoedias VI: 1) *Aten relegatam et Minervam restitutam* sive ludum allegoricum de rixa inter Studium Complutense et Taveram cardinalem; 2) quattuor fabulas ex italico versas; 3) *Chrysoniam*, quae praeter prologum periit, ex Apuleio derivatam.
- PISANUS UGOLINUS: vide supra 3.1.: Galli.
- RHODIUS THEODORUS (Ladenburg, ca. 1575 - Asselheim 19 I 1625): Roloff H.G., "Klassizismus im Deutschen Drama um 1600 - Beobachtungen an der 'Tragoedia Colignius' des Theodor Rhodius", in K.K. Polheim (ed.), *Sinn und Symbol. Festschrift für Joseph P. Strelka* (Bern - Frankfurt/M., New York, Paris, P. Lang, 1987), pp. 23-35.
- RUGGLE GEORGIUS (Lavenham, Suffolk, 1575 - Cambridge, 1622): *George Ruggle, Ignoramus*. Prepared with an Introduction by E.F.J. Tucker, *Renaissance Latin Drama in England*, II 1 (Hildesheim, Zürich, New York, G. Olms, 1987). Editio phototypica codicis manuscripti Oxon. Douce 43.
- DE SERRATA LEONARDUS (fl. Pavia/Milano, 1440): Jones J.R., "Comedia Poliscena. Introduction and Bibliographical Notes, Text and Translation", *Celestinesca*, 9 (1985), 85-94; — Id., "The Play of Poliscena, Composed by Leonardo Aretino", *Celestinesca*, 10 (1986), 45-67.
- SIMONIDES SIMON (Łwow, 1558 - Czernięcin, 1629): Rychlewska Ludovica, "De

- Simone Simonida Polonorum 'poeta regio' eiusque fabula, quae 'Castus Iosephus' inscribitur", *Academiae Latinitati fovendae commentarii*, 11 (Roma, Ist. Naz. di St. Romani, 1987), 69-79; — Ead., "De Angelo Maria Durini Mediolanensi Simonis Simonidae poesis editore", *ibid.*, 80-81.
- STUBBE EDMUNDUS (ca. 1595 - Huntingfield, Suffolk, 9 IV 1659): *Cancer*; Edmund Stubbe, *Fraus Honesta*. Prepared with an Introduction by Th. W. Best, *Renaissance Latin Drama in England*, II 2 (Hildesheim, New York, Zürich, G. Olms, 1987). Comoedia acta Cantabrigiae in Trinitate 10 II 1618/19, edita Londinii 1632; quae editio nunc phototypice est repetita.
- TRAGOEDUS ROMANUS (1612): Unterweg Fr.-K., "Thomas Morus, Tragoedia", *ACNG*, pp. 365-374.
- WATSON THOMAS: vide supra: Alabaster.

4. PROSA ORATIO

4.1. Generalia

- Delcorno C., "Dal 'sermo modernus' alla retorica 'borromea'", *Lettere italiane*, 39 (1987), 465-483.
- Murphy J.J., "Ciceronian Influences in Latin Rhetorical Compendia of the 15th Century", *ACNG*, pp. 521-530.
- Quaglioni D., "Coccodrilli umanistici: due orazioni per la morte di Callisto III", *Pluteus*, 3 (1985), 131-173. Oratores sunt Petrus de Monte et Iordanus Ursinus.
- Rohner L., *Die literarische Streitschrift. Themen, Motive, Formen* (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1987). Inter alia tractat rixam Erasmus inter et Huttenum.
- Schmugge L., *Die Kreuzzüge aus der Sicht humanistischer Geschichtsschreiber*, Vorträge der Aeneas-Silvius-Stiftung an der Universität Basel, 21 (Basel, Frankfurt/M., Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1987).
- AA. VV., *Semiotica della novella latina. Atti del seminario interdisciplinare "La novella latina"*, Perugia, 11-13 aprile 1985 (Roma, 1986).
- Vide et supra 1.2.: Francia (Prosateurs); Belgium Vetus (Ebels; Heesakkers); Dania (Pade); 1.3.: *L'Époque de la Renaissance*.

4.2. Scriptores pedestres

- ACQUAVIVA CLAUDIUS S.J. (1543-1615): Cardillo A., "Claudio Acquaviva e la *Ratio Studiorum*", in *De Lisio* (1987), pp. 419-438; — Lezza A., "I decreti sul tirannicidio di Claudio Acquaviva", in *De Lisio* (1987), pp. 399-417. Decretum (1614) editur in appendice.
- AENEAS SYLVIUS PICCOLOMINEUS: Damiani R., "Fortuna e scienza nei 'Commentarii' del Piccolomini", in *Zaccaria*, pp. 189-198; — vide et 2.2.
- AGRICOLA RUDOLFUS: Akkerman F. - Santing C.G., "Rudolf Agricola en de Aduarder Academie", *Groningse Volksalmanak. Historisch Jaarboek voor Groningen*, 1987, 6-28; — Nikolaou Maretta D., *Sprache als Welterschließung und Sprache als Norm. Ueberlegungen zu R. Agricola und J. Sturm*.

Diss. München (Neuried, Hieronymus Verlag, 1984); — Akkerman F. and Vanderjagt A.J. (Eds.), *Rodolphus Agricola Phrisius (1444-1485). Proceedings of the International Conference at the University of Groningen 28-30 October 1985* (Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1988). Continet orationes xxvi de vita, scriptis et cogitatis Agricolae, quibus notitiae multae usu receptae funditus novantur. Accessit bibliographia Agricolana primaria et secundaria locupletissima, quod fundamentum erit cuiusvis novae de Agricola investigationis doctae.

AGRIPPA DE NETTESHEIM HENRICUS CORNELIUS: Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa, *De la Supériorité des femmes (1509)*. Texte traduit du latin, présenté et annoté par B. Dubourg (Paris V*, Dervy-Livres, 26 rue Vauquelin, 1986); — vide et supra 1.4.: Rädle.

ALBERTUS LEO BAPTISTA: C. Grayson iudicium maximi momenti fecit editionis *Momi sive de Principe*, quam curavit R. Consolo (Genuae, 1986; cf. *HL*, 36 (1987), 322-323), *GSLI*, 164, fasc. 527 (1987), 458-463.

ANNIUS VITERBIENSIS: Ligońa C.R., "Annius of Viterbo and Historical Method", *Journal Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 50 (1987), 44-56; — Fumagalli E., "Precisazioni su Tito Manno Veltri e su Annio da Viterbo", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 135-140; — vide et infra: Snoy.

ANONYMUS BONONIENSIS: vide 1.5: Vergilius.

ARGYROPULUS JOANNES (Constantinopolis, ca. 1410 - Roma, 1487): Field A., "John Argyropoulos and the 'Secret Teachings' of Plato", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp. 299-326.

ANONYMUS MEXICANUS S.J. (ca. 1770): Viveros G., "El primer jesuita mexicano. Síntesis de la vida del P. Pedro Mercado (1546-1619)", *Nova Tellus*, 4 (Mexico, U.N.A.M., 1986), 223-235. Editur *Vita excerpta e Manipulo virorum aliquot zelo animarum illustrium seu flosculis in campo Mexicanæ Provinciae S.J.* (cuius codex Romae servatur in Archivo Historico S.J.).

AURELIUS CORNELIUS (Gouda, ca. 1460/62 - Eemstein, 8 VIII 1531): Tilmans Karin, *Aurelius en de Divisiechroniek van 1517. Historiografie en humanisme in Holland in de tijd van Erasmus*, Hollandse Studiën, 21 (NL-1213 XS Hilversum, Uitgeverij Verloren, Alexanderlaan 14, 1988: venit florenis Holl. 45). Tractat etiam vitam et cetera opera Aurelii, item alios priscos rerum Batavicarum scriptores (Snoy, Geldenhouwer). Ipsum Chronicum nederlandice scriptum est et sine nomine auctoris olim divulgatum; — Ead., "Cornelius Aurelius en het ontstaan van de Bataafse mythe in de Hollandse geschiedschrijving (tot 1517)", in Ebels-Hoving B., Santing C.G., Tilmans C.P.H.M. (edd.), *Genoechlicke ende lustige historiën. Laat-middeleeuwse geschiedschrijving in Nederland* (Hilversum, Verloren, 1987), pp. 191-213; — Ead., "Cornelius Aurelius (c. 1460-1531), praeceptor Erasmi?", *Agricola*, pp. 200-210.

AURISPA JOANNES (ca. 1375-1459): Gericke Ph.O., "Lucian's Twelfth Dialogue of the Dead in Three Fifteenth Century Versions", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 127-135. Aurispae interpretatio comparatur cum duabus aliis, quae hispanice scriptae sunt a Ramírez de Guzman (?) et Martino de Avila.

BALBUS PETRUS PISANUS: vide supra 1.5.: Dionysius Areopagita (Monfasani).

- BARCLAIUS JOANNES: Cullière A., "Jean Barclay contre les Jésuites de Pont-à-Mousson: approche de la toute première édition de l'*Euphormion*", in *JESU*, pp. 207-218.
- BARONIUS CAESAR: Borrelli M., "I fratelli Vosmeer e il Cardinale Baronio", in *Sodalitas: Studi in onore di Antonio Guarino*, vol. 8 (Napoli, Jovene, 1984), pp. 3835-3908.
- BARZIZZA GASPARIUS: Condoñer Carmen, "Un nuevo manuscrito del comentario de G. Barzizza a las epístolas de Séneca", *Emerita*, 55 (1987), 265-271. De codice ms. Salmanticensi, bib. univ. 12; — vide et supra 1.9. (Grafia).
- BEATUS RHENANUS: Hieronymus Fr., "Ein vergessener Brief des Rhenanus und andere vergessene Briefe an Nicolaus Episcopus", *Annuaire de Sélestat*, 1987, 157-175. Eduntur ignotae litterae Beati Rhenani (1), Martini Lipsii (3), Petri Nannii (1), Andreae Osiandri (1) et Joannis Costeri Lovaniensis (1). Servatae sunt a Joanne Isacio Pontano, *Iusti Lipsi Epistolarum... decades XIII* (Harderovici, 1621), pp. 94-107; — vide et supra 2.2.: Souperus.
- BECCADELLI LUDOVICUS: vide infra: Panormita.
- BEMBUS PETRUS: Grant J.N., "Pietro Bembo and Vat. Lat. 3226", *HL*, 37 (1988), 211-243. Quomodo Terentii codice usus sit in conscribendo dialogo *De Vergilii Culice et Terentii fabulis* (1503; ed. 1530).
- BENZELIUS ERICUS (1675-1743): Nilsson Nylander Eva, "Erik Benzeliuss' brev. En lärd korrespondens från 1700-talet", in *Lit-Laer*, pp. 75-81.
- BESSARION: vide infra: Perottus.
- BEVERLANDUS (BARLANDUS) HADRIANUS: De Smet R., "Epistolae Tullianae: brieven van Hadriaan Beverland (1650-1716)", *De Gulden Passer*, 64 (Antwerpen, 1986), 83-124; 65 (1987), 71-101. Triginta epistolae ex codice Leidensi BPL 204 annis 1679-1685 scriptae. Corrige in 1, 19 Indignantur (non: indignuntur); 24 pulpitis (non: pulputis); 3, 1 minio (non: nimio); 4, 13-15 perperam explicatum est. Non agitur de editione quadam mense Septembri paranda; verbis Horatianis ("nonum in mensem cogitata premam") auctor significat se scripta sua diu retractaturum esse priusquam edat; 7, 14 "Britannico" pertinet ad ad "Miltono", non alterum virum significat; 9, 5 lege: subselliis; 14: incunabulis; 16-17 lege: sorbeo (non sordio; cf. 18, 46-47!); 10, 6: satagere, non fatagere; 18, 6 magnum (non: magnam); 33 balatrones, non blatrones; 25, 6 exhalem (non: exhalam); 26, 23 apolactizavit, non apolactizavit; 30, 4 Famae, non Hamae (J.IJ); — Id., "The Realm of Venus. Hadriani Barlandi (H. Beverland) *De Prostibulis Veterum*, Ms. Leiden BPL 1994", *Quaerendo*, 17 (1987), 45-59; — Id., "Citations de Martial dans le *De Prostibulis Veterum* de Beverland", *L'Antiquité Classique*, 56 (1987), 219-242.
- BEYERLINCK LAURENTIUS (Antwerpen, 1578-1627): IJsewijn J., "Beyerlinck Laurentius", in *Nationaal Biografisch Woordenboek*, 12 (Brussel, 1987), col. 59-67. Nova quaedam de studiis eius theologicis adfert P. Vandermeersch, "The Reconstruction of the *Liber Quintus Intitulatorum Universitatis Lovaniensis* (1569-1616). Part Two: the Theologians, 1579-1605", *Lias*, 13 (1986), 1-67. Factus est S.T. licenciatus die 14 Junii 1606.

- BIDERMANNUS JACOBUS S.J.: Schneiders S., "Jacob Bidermanns 'Utopia' im Spiegel der Forschung, 1704-1984", *Archiv. Histor. Societatis Iesu*, 57 (1988), 171-177.
- BOCCACCIUS JOANNES: Dallapiazza M., *Die Boccaccio-Handschriften in den deutschsprachigen Ländern. Eine Bibliographie*, Gratia, 17 (Bamberg, Stefan Wendel Verlag, 1988). Elenchus brevis codicum manu scriptorum in bibliothecis rerum publicarum, quae nunc germanice loquuntur. Desunt igitur Alsatia, Bohemiae pars olim germanica, etc. Additae sunt interpretationes et retractationes germanicae ante annum 1500 factae, item mentiones in catalogis bibliothecarum medioevalibus. Desiderantur indices nominum et locorum; — Neuhausen K.A., "Boccaccios *Genealogie deorum gentilium libri XV*: Corrigenda zur Ausgabe von Vincenzo Romano", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 251-252; — vide et 2.2.
- BODINUS JOANNES (1530-1596): Faltenbacher K.Fr., *Das Colloquium Heptaplomeres, ein Religionsgespräch zwischen Scholastik und Aufklärung. Untersuchungen zur Thematik und zur Frage der Autorschaft*, Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 13: Franz. Sprache und Lit. (Bern, Frankfurt/M., New York, P. Lang, 1988). Dubium proponitur de auctore. Opus fortasse Venetiis ca. 1600 conditum.
- BONFINIUS ANTONIUS (saec. XV): Greco A., "Ritratto di Antonio Bonfini", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 153-158; — vide et 1.2.: Hungaria (Feuer-Tóth).
- BORRICHIUS: vide infra: Morus (Petersen).
- BORROMAEUS FREDERICUS: Torno A., Federico Borromeo. *De pestilentia* (Milano, Lib. Bocca, 1984).
- BRUNUS JORDANUS († Roma, 17 II 1600): Gosselin E.A., "Fra Giordano Bruno's Catholic Passion", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp. 537-561; — Sturlese Rita, *Bibliografia, censimento e storia delle antiche stampe di Giordano Bruno*, Quaderni di "Rinascimento", 6 (Firenze, Olschki, 1987).
- BRUNUS LEONARDUS: Boje Mortensen L., "Leonardo Bruni's *Dialogus*. A Ciceronian Debate on the Literary Culture of Florence", *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 37 (1986), 259-302; — Davies M.C., "An Enigma and a Phantom: Giovanni Aretino and Giacomo Languschi", *HL*, 37 (1988), 1-29. Illuminat duas epistolas Brunianas (IV 18 et 20, Mehus); — Dees R., "Bruni, Aristotle, and the Mixed Regime in 'On the Constitution of the Florentines'", *Mediaevalia et Humanistica*, N.S., 15 (1987), 1-23; — *Epistolario di Leonardo Bruni: Censimento dei Codici: Sintesi delle comunicazioni (Seminario di studio, Fir. 30 ottobre 1987)* (Firenze, Roma, Ist. Storico Ital. per il Medio Evo, 1987); — Gualdo Rosa Lucia, "Leonardo Bruni, l'Oratio in hypocritas' e i suoi difficili rapporti con Ambrogio Traversari", *Vita monastica*, 41, num. 168-169 (1987), 189-199; — Maltese E.V., "Una storia della Grecia dopo Mantinea in età umanistica", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 201-208. Praeter Brunum etiam tractatur Joachim Camerarius, *Narratio ... temporis secuti praelium ad Mantineam* (Lipsiae, 1546); — vide et infra: Perottus (Pace).
- BUCERUS MARTINUS (1491-1551): *Opera latina*, vol. II: *Enarratio in Evangelion Iohannis (1528, 1530, 1536)*, publié par Irène Backus, *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought*, 40 (Leiden, Brill, 1988).

- BUCHANANUS GEORGIUS: Gerlo A., "An Unpublished Latin Letter of George Buchanan to Marnix of Saint Aldegonde", in *S.V. Br.*, pp.43-54. Anglice editur commentatio cum editione epistolae, quae anno 1983 nederlandice prodiit: vide Instrumentum anni 1984 (*HL*, 33 (1984), 330); — vide et 2.2.; 3.2.
- BUDAEUS GULIELMUS: Guillaume Budé, *L'étude des lettres: Principes pour sa juste et bonne institution - De Studio literarum recte et commode instituendo*. Texte original traduit, présenté et annoté par M.-M. de la Garanderie avec les additions et corrections inédites de l'auteur (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1988); — Gadoffre G., "Guillaume Budé e la storia di Roma", *Studi Romani*, 35 (1987), 263-276; — De la Garanderie Marie-M., "Un vrai dialogue: Le De Philologia de Guillaume Budé", *ACNG*, pp.491-502.
- BUSBEQUIUS OGERIUS: Voet L., "Un humaniste et son éditeur au XVI^e siècle: Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq et Christophe Plantin", *Mémoires de la Société d'histoire de Comines-Warneton et de la région*, 16 (1986), 27-46.
- CAELIUS Rhodiginus, LUDOVICUS: Mulryan J., "The *Lectioenum Antiquarum* of Ludovicus Caelius and the Italian Mythographers", *ACNG*, pp.99-106.
- CALVINUS JOANNES: *In Honor of John Calvin, 1509-64. Papers from the 1986 International Calvin Symposium McGill University*. Edited by E.J. Furcha (Montreal, McGill University, Faculty of Religious Studies, 1987); — vide et supra 2.2.
- CAMERARIUS JOACHIM: vide supra: Brunus Leonardus (Maltese).
- CARTESIUS RENATUS: René Descartes, *Meditationes de prima philosophia/Meditationen über die erste Philosophie. Lateinisch/Deutsch*. Uebersetzt und herausgegeben von G. Schmidt, Reclams Universalbibliothek, 2888 (Ditzingen, Ph. Reclam jun., 1986).
- CASELLA PETRUS LEO (L'Aquila, ca. 1540 - Roma, ca. 1620): Gombrich E.H., "An Early Seventeenth-Century Canon of Artistic Excellence: Pierleone Casella's *Elogia illustrium artificum* of 1606", *Journal Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 50 (1987), 224-232. Editio, interpretatio anglica, notae.
- CASTIGLIONE JOSEPHUS: vide infra: Ursinus Fulvius.
- CHRYSOLORAS EMMANUEL: vide supra 1.5.: Plato (Hankins).
- CIOFANUS HERCULES: Papponetti G. - Ghisetti Giavarina A., "Un' effigie quattrocentesca di Ovidio", *IMU*, 29 (1986), 283-297. De studiis Ovidianis Ciofani.
- CLERICUS (LE CLERC) JOANNES (1657-1736): Jean Le Clerc, *Epistolario*, vol. 1: 1679-1689. A cura di M. Sina, Le Corrispondenze letterarie, scientifiche ed erudite dal Rinascimento all' età moderna, 1 (Firenze, Olschki, 1987).
- COCHLAEUS JOANNES: IJsewijn J., "Traiectum Superius = Maastricht (Ad J. Cochlaeum, Germ. VIII 27)", *HL*, 37 (1988), 272.
- COLER CHRISTOPHORUS (Kitzingen, ca. 1570 - Praha?, 1604?): Bonfatti E., "Der andere Christophorus Coler (ca. 1570-1604) oder die Anfänge der politischen Bibliographie", *WBN*, 14 (1987), 97-112. Philologus, iurisperitus. Agitur de *Epistola de studio politico ordinando* (Hanoviae, 1602, in: *Taciti... Germaniae libellus, et in eum Christophori Coleri commentatio*, pp.88-117).

- COLLENUCCIUS PANDULPHUS PISAURENSIS (saec. XV): Coturri E., "La polemica fra Pandolfo Collenuccio e il Leonicensino per Plinio", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 73-76.
- CONRINGIUS HERMANNUS (1606-1681): Fasolt C., "Conring on History", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp. 563-587.
- COPERNICUS NICOLAUS: *Complete Works*, III: *Minor Works*. Edited by P. Czartoryski; Translation and Commentary by E. Rosen, With the Assistance of Erna Hilfstein (Warszawa-Kraków, Polish Academy, 1985).
- CORNAEUS MELCHIOR S.J.: Blum P.R., "Science and Scholasticism in Melchior Cornaeus S.J.", *ACNG*, pp. 573-580.
- CORSIGNANI PETRUS ANTONIUS (Celano, 13 I 1686 - 17 X 1751): *Pietro Antonio Corsignani nel terzo centenario della nascita (1686-1986). Atti del Convegno di studio (Celano, 8-9 novembre 1986)*. A cura di M. Buonocore e G. Morelli (L'Aquila, L.U. Japadre editore, 1987). *Historicus et archaeologus de rebus Marsicanis, hagiographus, sodalis Arcadiae Romanae*.
- CORTESIUS ANTONIUS: vide infra: Valla (Antonazzi).
- CORTESIUS PAULUS (Roma, 1465 - S. Gimignano, 1510): Viti P., "La Valdelsa e l'umanesimo: i Cortesi", in *Call. Esp.*, pp. 246-299. Additur pp. 293-299: Postilla sul "De hominibus doctis" di Paolo Cortesi.
- COSTERUS JOANNES: vide supra: Beatus Rhenanus.
- CRUCIUS LEVINUS: vide 2.2.
- CRISIUS MARTINUS: Berger G., "Rhetorik und Leserlenkung in der Aithiopika-Epitome des Martinus Crusius", *ACNG*, pp. 481-490.
- CUNAEUS PETRUS (Vlissingen, 1586 - Leiden, 1638): Sierra de Cózar A., "Otros dos pasajes de Livio en las sátiras de Lipsio y Cunaeus", *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica*, 19 (Madrid, 1985), 183-185.
- CUSPINIANUS JOANNES: Korinman M., "Maximilien: les fondements césariens de l'empire", in *César*, pp. 147-156. *De Caesaribus atque imperatoribus romanis* (1540).
- CYRIACUS ANCONITANUS: Neuhausen K.A., "De Cyriaci Anconitani quibusdam ad Mercurium deum precationibus", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 243-250; — vide et supra 1.5.: Dictys Cretensis.
- DE AVENDAÑO DIDACUS S.J. (Segovia, 29? IX 1594 - Lima, 30 VIII 1688): Losada A., "Diego de Avendaño S.J. moralista y jurista, defensor de la dignidad humana de indios y negros en América (Segovia 27 ó 29.IX.1594 - Lima 30.VIII.1688)", *Missionalia Hispanica*, 39 (Madrid, 1982), 1-18. *Tractat Thesaurum Indicum* (Antverpiae, 1668).
- DE EGUIARA Y EGUREN JOHANNES JOSEPHUS, *Bibliotheca Mexicana*. Edición preparada por Ernesto de la Torre Villar (México, U.N.A.M., 1986). Editio anastatica editionis 1755.
- DECEMBRIUS HUBERTUS: vide 1.5.: Plato.
- DESPAUTERIUS JOANNES (Ninove, ca. 1480 - Komen, 1520): Henderson Judith Rice, "Despauterius' *Syntaxis* (1509). The Earliest Publication of Erasmus' *De Conscribendis Epistolis*", *HL*, 37 (1988), 175-210; — vide et 2.2.: Crucius L.
- DOLETUS STEPHANUS: Lloyd-Jones K., "Renaissance Rhetoric: Dolet's *Oratio*

- nes in Tholosam (1533-1534)", *Neolatin Bulletin* 4 (Christian Heritage College, El Cajon, CA. 92019, USA, 1988). 14-18.
- EILSCHOV FREDERICUS CHRISTIANUS (Fyn, 1725 - København, 1750): Christensen J., "F.C. Eilshov og hans sprogdannende virke", *Lit-Laer*, pp. 65-74. *Scripsit Cogitationes de scientiis vernacula lingua docendis cum specimine terminologiae vernaculae*.
- ERASMUS DESIDERIUS: *The Correspondence of Erasmus. Letters 1122 to 1251. 1520 to 1521*. Translated by R.A.B. Mynors, annotated by P.G. Bietenholz, *Collected Works of Erasmus*, 8 (Toronto, University Press, 1988); — *Opera Omnia*, II 4: *Adagiorum chlias secunda*, edd. F. Heinimann et E. Kienzle, *Pars altera* (Amsterdam, North-Holland, 1987). Continet *Adagia* 1501-2000.
- Dix Conférences sur Erasme: 1536-1986. Éloge de la Folie. Colloques*. Études réunies par C. Blum (Genève, Slatkine, 1988); — Bierlaire F., "La première édition falsifiée des *Colloques*", in *Dix Conférences sur Erasme*, pp. 79-93; — Bosbach F., "Die Propaganda Karls V. in der Kritik des Erasmus", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 27-47; — Elsom Helen E., "Apuleius in Erasmus' *Lingua*", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 125-134. — Erasmus of Rotterdam Society, *Yearbook Seven* (1987) (Fort Washington, Md. 20744, U.S.A., 1987). Continet G. Marc'hadour, "Erasmus: First and Best Biographer of Thomas More" (pp. 1-32); J.C. Olin, "Erasmus and S. Jerome" (pp. 33-53); Erika Rummel, "God and Solecism: Erasmus as a Literary Critic of the Bible" (pp. 54-72); J. Campbell Boswell, "The Reception of Erasmus' *Moria* in England Through 1640" (pp. 73-95); — Christ-von Wedel Christine, "Das 'Lob der Torheit' des Erasmus von Rotterdam im Spiegel der spätmittelalterlichen Narrenbilder und die Einheit des Werkes", *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte*, 78 (1987), 24-36; — Crahay R., "Le procès d'Erasme à la fin du XVI^e siècle. Position de quelques jésuites", in *Colloque érasmien de Liège* (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1987), pp. 115-133. Socii Iesu sunt Antonius Possevinus (Mantova, 1533 - Ferrara, 1611), Hieronymus Torrensis (Montalbàn, 1527 - München, 1611) et Petrus Canisius; — De Michelis Pintacuda Fiorella, "L'*Institutio principis christiani* di Erasmo da Rotterdam", *MEFRM*, pp. 261-273; — DeMolen R.L., *The Spirituality of Erasmus of Rotterdam*, *Bibliotheca Humanistica & Reformatorica*, 40 (Nieuwkoop, De Graaf, 1987); — Dust Ph.C., *Three Renaissance Pacifists. Essays in the Theories of Erasmus, More and Vives*, *American University Studies, Series IX: History*, 23 (New York, P. Lang, 1987); — Funke H., "Epistolographie und Rhetorik. Beobachtungen zu Erasmus' *De conscribendis epistolis*", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 93-99; — Gerlo A., *Erasmus van Rotterdam. Zeven studies*, *Bibliotheca Humanistica & Reformatorica*, 41 (Nieuwkoop, De Graaf, 1988); — IJsewijn J., "Castigationes Erasmianae, IX", *HL*, 37 (1988), 263-265; — Id., "Zur Interpretation von Erasmus, 'De Contemptu Mundi', cap. VII", *WRM* 12 (1988), 62-64; — McCutcheon Elizabeth, "Margaret More Roper's Translation of Erasmus' *Precatio Dominica*", *ACNG*, pp. 659-666; — Margolin J.-Cl., "Érasme entre Charles-Quint et Ferdinand I^{er}, et le modèle érasmien du prince chrétien", *MEFRM*, pp. 275-301; — Miller Cl.H., "Styles and Mixed

- Genres in Erasmus' *Praise of Folly*", *ACNG*, pp.277-288; — O'Malley J.W., "Grammar and Rhetoric in the *pietas* of Erasmus", *JMRS*, 18 (1988), 81-98; — Schoeck R.J., "Agricola and Erasmus: Erasmus' Inheritance of Northern Humanism", *Agricola*, pp.181-188; — Schweppenhäuser G., "Narrenschelte und Pathos der Vernunft. Zum Narrenmotiv bei Sebastian Brant und Erasmus von Rotterdam", *Neophilologus*, 71 (1987), 559-574; — Seidel Menchi Silvana, *Erasmus in Italia 1520-1580*, Nuova Cultura, 1 (Torino, Bollati Boringhieri Ed., 1987); — Tracy J.D., "Two Erasmuses, Two Luthers: Erasmus' Strategy in Defense of *De Libero Arbitrio*", *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 78 (1987), 37-60; — Van der Blom N., "Philologica Erasmiana II", *Moreana*, 25 num. 97 (1988), 47-56; — Id., "Apologie pour l'authenticité de trois lettres d'Érasme (Allen 872, 983, 1088)", *ibid.*, 57-61; — Vredevelde H., "The Word 'anormis' in Erasmus' *De praeparatione ad mortem*", *HL*, 37 (1988), 265-266; — *Erasmus in English* 15 (Toronto U.P. 1987/88) haec opuscula continet: De Jonge H.J., "The Relationship of Erasmus' Translation of the New Testament to that of the Pauline Epistles by Lefèvre d'Étaples" (pp.2-7); Bateman J.J., "From Soul to Soul: Persuasion in Erasmus' Paraphrases on the New Testament" (pp.7-16); Sider R.D., "'In Terms Quite Plain and Clear': The Exposition of Grace in the New Testament Paraphrases of Erasmus" (pp.16-25); Rummel Erika, "Erasmus' New Testament Scholarship: Originals and Facsimiles" (pp.25-27); Dalzell Ann, "Erasmus' Horse: the Meaning of 'aures' in Ep. 867" (pp.29-30); Andrews M.C., "Erasmus and *Macbeth*: 'Making the Green One Red'" (pp.30-31); — vide et 1.5.: Theognis; 3.2.: Anonymus Flander; 4.2.: Despauterius; infra: Morus (White).
- AB EYB ALBERTUS: vide supra 2.2: Petrarca: Feo.
- FARA MARTINUS (s. XVI): *Oratio habita a Fara D. Martino Iaponio, Reprinted from the Authorized Text* (Tokyo, Yushodo Booksellers Ltd., 1978). Orationem A.D. 1587 Goae habuit, cum ab Europa rediret. Excusa est Goae anno 1588.
- FICINUS MARSILIUS: Klutstein Ilana, *Marsilio Ficino et la théologie ancienne. Oracles Chaldaïques - Hymnes Orphiques - Hymnes de Proclus*, Quaderni di "Rinascimento", 5 (Firenze, Olschki, 1987). Editio critica; — Kristeller P.O., *Marsilio Ficino and His Work after Five Hundred Years*, Quaderni di "Rinascimento", 7 (Firenze, L. Olschki, 1987). Continet 1) novam editionem orationis habitae in Conventu Ficiniiano 1984; 2) epistolas et documenta IX nova; 3) bibliographiam Ficinianam; 4) elenchum codicum mss. Ficinianorum; 5) addenda et corrigenda in scriptis P.O. Kristeller, etc.; — Allen M.J.B., "Marsilio Ficino's Interpretation of Plato's *Timaeus* and its Myth of the Demiurge", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp.399-439; — Copenhaver B.P., "Iamblichus, Synesius and the Chaldean Oracles in Marsilio Ficino's *De Vita libri tres*: Hermetic Magic or Neoplatonic Magic?", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp.441-467; — Gentile S., "Note sullo 'scrittoio' di Marsilio Ficino", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp.339-397; — Cotturi E., "Marsilio Ficino medico", *RPL* 11 (1988), 107-109; — Früchtel E., "Einige Bemerkungen zu Zeit und Zeitlichkeit in der *Platonica Theologia* des Marsilius

- Ficinus", in *Agora. Perspektiven der Philosophie*, Bd. 13. *Zu Ehren von Rudolph Berlinger* (Amsterdam - Würzburg, Rodopi, 1987); — Tournoy G., "Marsile Ficin, Agricola et leurs traductions de l'*Axiochos*", *Agricola*, pp.211-218; — Vasoli C., "Mercure dans la tradition ficinienne", in *Mercure à la Renaissance* [vide 1.5.: MERCURIUS], pp.27-44. — vide et 1.5.: Dionysius Areopagita.
- FLORIUS FRANCISCUS FLORENTINUS: Beltran E., "Un discours inconnu de Francesco Florio sur la Rhétorique", *BHR*, 50 (1988), 101-109. Editur "De laudibus rhetorice, Parisius, aprilis 1466" e cod. Stutgardiensis (Württ. Landesbibl. HB X 24, ff. 65^v - 68^v). Fugit editorem alterum orationis extare codicem Cantabrigiae in biblioth. univ. (Ms. Addit. 6676); hunc codicem manibus suis descripsit Hieronymus Monetarius (Münzer) anno 1470 "in Studio Lipzensi dum humanitatis studiis incumbere" (G.T.).
- FRISCHLINUS NICODEMUS: Price D., "Nicodemus Frischlin's Rhetoric", *ACNG*, pp. 531-540; — vide et 3.2.
- FUSCUS HIERONYMUS (fl. Romae, 1608): vide infra: Valla (Antonazzi).
- GALATEUS ANTONIUS DE FERRARIIS: Andreoli Nemola Paola, "Il Galateo tra prima e seconda stesura della *Vituperatio*", *Studi e problemi di critica testuale*, 35 (1987), 91-120; — Tateo Fr., "La raccolta delle epistole di Antonio de Ferrariis Galateo", *ACNG*, pp. 551-561.
- GASSENDUS PETRUS (Champtercier, 1592 - Paris, 1655): Joy, Lynn S., *Gassendi the Atomist. Advocate of History in an Age of Science* (Cambridge, Univ. Press, 1988). De vita, operibus et momento philosophico Petri Gassendi; — Jones H., "Gassendi's Defence of Galileo: The Politics of Discretion", *ACNG*, pp. 221-232.
- GAURICUS LUCAS (1475-1558): Di Lorenzo E., "La lettura del *De ocio liberali* di Luca Gaurico", in *De Lisis* (1987), pp.285-296. Opusculum editum est Romae, 1557.
- GAZA THEODORUS: vide supra 1.5.: Dionysius Areopagita.
- GEMMA FRISIUS: De Smet A., "Gemma Frisius", in *Biographie Nationale de Belgique*, 44 = Dernier supplément, t. XVI, 2, col. 526-545 (Brussel, 1986).
- GEORGIUS TRAPEZUNTIVS: vide 1.5.: Consolatio.
- GERHARD LAURENTIUS: Eichenseer C., "Saxa fossilique Bavariae", *Vox Latina*, 23 (1987), 536-541. E libro, c.t. *Brevis Bavariae geographia* (Wirceburgi, 1844), referuntur pp.54-60 de saxis et fossilibus, quae in solo Bavarico reperiuntur.
- GRAVATIUS NICOLAUS ANTONIUS (fl. ca. 1562-72?): Acuña R., "La *Alexandri Tartagni Imolensis vita* compuesta por Nicolás Antonio Gravazzio", *Nova Tellus*, 4 (Mexico, U.N.A.M., 1986), 199-222.
- GROTIUS HUGO: *Meletius sive de iis quae inter christianos conveniunt epistola*. Critical Edition with Translation, Commentary and Introduction by G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes, *Studies in the History of Christian Thought*, 40 (Leiden, Brill, 1988). Editio princeps e codice manuscripto singulari cura et peritia prolata. Opus omni laude perdignum. Corrigan mendulum typographicum, p.77, 19: *persuasione pro peruasione*; — Rabbie E., "Some Remarks Concerning the Textual History of Hugo Grotius' *De Satisfactione*", *Grotiana*, N.S., 7 (1986), 99-111.

- GRUTERUS JANUS: vide supra 1.5: Alba Amicorum.
- GUARINUS BAPTISTA: vide supra 1.5: Consolatio.
- GUARINUS VERONENSIS: Shaw Anne MacDonald, "References to Vergil and Homer in the Letters of Guarino Veronese", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 193-200; — vide et 1.5.: Plato.
- GUARNA ANDREAS: vide supra 1.4.: Rädle.
- HAEDUS (CAPRETTO) PETRUS (Pordenone, 1427 - 1504): vide infra: Valla (Antonazzi).
- HEGEL GEORGIUS GULIELMUS FREDERICUS (Stuttgart, 1770 - Berlin, 1831): *Dissertatio philosophica de orbitis planetarum: philosophische Erörterung über die Planetenbahnen*. Uebersetzt, eingeleitet und kommentiert von W. Neuser, Schriften zur Naturphilosophie, 2 (Weinheim, VCH Verlag, 1986). Habilitationsschrift, Jena, 1801.
- HEINSIUS DANIEL: Rabbie E., "Daniel Heinsius over het beleg van Den Bosch in 1629", in Desmense W. - Hoogervorst C. (edd.), *Terugblik en Vergezicht, Bijdragen... Stedelijk Gymnasium 's-Hertogenbosch* ('s-Hertogenbosch, 1987), pp. 61-68. De origine et fortuna *Rerum ad Sylvam Ducis anno 1629 gestarum historiae*; — vide et 2.2.; 3.1.: Sellin.
- HELMONTIUS JOANNES BAPTISTA (Brussel, 1578/79 - Vilvoorde, 1644): Halleux R., "Helmontiana II. Le Prologue de l'*Eisagoge*, la conversion de Van Helmont au Paracelsisme, et les Songes de Descartes", in *Academiae Analecta. Mededelingen Kon. Acad. voor Wetensch., Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België. Klasse der Wetenschappen*, 49 (1988), num. 2, pp. 17-36. Proponitur interpretatio francogallica prologi operis iuvenilis, c.t. *Eisagoge in artem medicam a Paracelso restitutam* (1607). Prologus somnium narrat initiatorum. Comparantur somnia Cartesii.
- HENELIUS NICOLAUS: vide supra 1.2.: Germania (Białek).
- HOLBERGIUS LUDOVICUS: vide infra: Morus (Petersen).
- HOLSTENIUS LUCAS: Rietbergen P.J.A.N., "Lucas Holstenius (1596-1661), Seventeenth-century Scholar, Librarian and Book-collector. A Preliminary Note", *Quaerendo*, 17 (1987), 205-231.
- HUGENIUS CONSTANTINUS: Schenkeveld-van der Dussen M.A., "Otium en *Otia*", in *Veelzijdigheid als levensvorm: Facetten van Constantijn Huygens' leven en werk. Een bundel studies ... bijeengebracht door A.Th. van Deursen, E.K. Grootes, P.E.L. Verkuyll*, Deventer Studiën, 2 (Deventer, 1987), pp. 195-000. De *Otorum* Hugenianorum epistula dedicatoria; — vide et 2.2.
- HUNTERUS JACOBUS: Sellberg E., "En landsflyktig lyckosökare: Jacob Hunterus och hans Brevsamling", *Lit-Laer*, pp. 82-94. *Hunteri Epistolae miscellaneae editae sunt Vindobonae anno 1631*.
- HUTTENUS UDALRICUS: vide 1.8; 2.2.
- INGHIRAMUS THOMAS 'PHAEDRUS' († Roma, 1516): D'Ascia L., "Una *Laudatio Ciceronis* inedita di Tommaso 'Fedro' Inghirami", *Rivista di letteratura italiana*, 5 (1987), 479-501. Oratio prolata est e codice LIH.4.8, ff. 25^r - 38^r, Bibliothecae Guarnaccianae Volaterranae. Dicta est, ut videtur, paulo ante mortem Phaetri.
- JOANNES ARETINUS: vide supra: Brunus Leonardus (Davies).

- JOANNES III SOBIESKI, REX POLONIAE (1629-1696): Gramatowski W. S.J., "Giovanni Sobieski e la Compagnia di Gesù: la Corrispondenza conservata nell' ARSI: 1670-1694", *Archiv. Histor. Societatis Iesu*, 56 (1987), 267-291. Epistolae latinae XIX, inter quas una ad Ferdinandum Verbiest (16 XI 1688).
- IOVIUS PAULUS: *Atti del Convegno "Paolo Giovio. Il Rinascimento e la Memoria" (Como, 3-5 giugno 1983)* (Como, Società storica Comense, 1985).
- IUNIUS FRANCISCUS: Nativel Colette, "Le *De pictura Veterum* de Franciscus Junius: le musée imaginaire d'un philologue", *ACNG*, pp. 107-116.
- LAGALLA JULIUS CAESAR (Padula, 1571 - Roma, 1624): Gallo I., "Il filosofo padulese Giulio Cesare Lagalla tra Aristotele e Galilei", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 111-125; — Id., "Ancora su Giulio Cesare Lagalla: medicina e tecnica della dissimulazione", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 167-174.
- LANDIVAR RAPHAEL S.J. (Guatemala, 1731 - Bologna, 1793): Peñalosa J.A., *Rafael Landivar, Orador y prosista latino. Copia facsimilar de la edición de 1766* (Mexico, Editorial Ius, 1985). Editio phototypica *Funebris declamationis ... in funere ... Francisci Josephi de Figueredo et Victoria, Popaianensis primum episcopi, deinde archiepiscopi Guathimalensis*. Unicum est specimen orationis pedestris Raphaelis Landivar. Praemissa est introductio historica; sequitur interpretatio hispanica.
- LEIBNITIUS GOTHOFREDUS GULIELMUS: Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, hrsg. von der Akad. der Wissenschaften der DDR, 4. Reihe: *Politische Schriften*, 3. Band: 1677-1689 (Berlin, 1986); — Kuntz P.Gr., "Leibniz's Theory of Order", *ACNG*, pp. 625-634; — Losoncy Th., "Philosophical Notions of Certitude and Identity in Leibniz", *ib.*, pp. 635-640.
- LEONICENUS NICOLAUS VICENTINUS: vide supra: Collenuccius.
- LIPSIUS IUSTUS: *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*, Pars III: 1588-1590. Eas ediderunt, adnotatione critica instruxerunt notisque illustrarunt Sylvette Sué & H. Peeters (Brussel, Kon. Acad. W.L.S.K., Paleis der Academiën, 1987); — Schrijvers P.H., "La présence de César dans Juste Lipse", in *César*, pp. 239-245; — vide et supra: Cunaeus.
- LIPSIUS MARTINUS: vide supra: Beatus Rhenanus. Novae litterae monstrant Lipsium annis 1543 et 1551 Lovanii et Antverpiae egisse, quod antea ignorabatur.
- LOCKE JOHANNES: Ginsberg R., "Strategy and Principle in John Locke's *Epistola de Tolerantia*", *ACNG*, pp. 609-616.
- LONGOLIUS (VAN LANGERACK) GISBERTUS (Utrecht, 1507 - Köln, 30 V 1543): Finger H. - Bengel Anita, *Der Kölner Professor Gisbert Longolius - Leibartz Erzbischof Hermanns von Wied - und die Reste seiner Bibliothek in der Universitätsbibliothek Düsseldorf* (Düsseldorf, Universitätsbibliothek, 1987). Vita et librorum catalogus. Scripsit i.a. *Dialogum de avibus*, quem edidit Gulielmus Turnerus († 1563), medicus anglicus (Coloniae, 1544). In fine eduntur epigrammata et elegiae in obitum Longolii, quas conscripserunt Ph. Melanchthon (pp. 154-155), Gulielmus Turnerus (p. 156), Andreas von Mandels(ch)lo, iuris studiosus e Moringen (p. 157), Albertus Horsta-

- nus, graece et latine (pp.157-159), et Jacobus Trellius Daventriensis (p. 160).
- LÓPEZ (LUPIUS) VINCENTIUS S.J. (Lucena/Cordoba, 15 XI 1691 - Mexico, 19 II 1757): Vicente López, *De bibliotheca domini doctoris Joannis Iosephi Eguiarae, et Mexicanorum ingenio Aprilis Dialogus - Diálogo de Abril...* Introducción, traducción y notas de Silvia Vargas Alquicira, *Bibliotheca humanistica Mexicana*, 2 (México, U.N.A.M., Instituto de investigaciones filológicas; centro de Estudios Clásicos, 1987). *Dialogus hic praemissus erat Bibliothecae Mexicanae*, id est operi Joannis Iosephi de Eguira y Eguren anno 1755 Mexici foras dato (et anno 1986 Mexici anastatice impresso). Colloquuntur Hispanus, Belga, Italus.
- LUTHER MARTINUS: Schilling J., "Latinistische Hilfsmittel zum Lutherstudium", *Lutherjahrbuch*, 55 (1988), 83-101. Post capita de Luthero et lingua latina necnon de studiis Latinitatis Lutheranae, instrumenta docta proponuntur: enchiridia, lexica (vetera et nova), interpretationes, etc.
- MAFFEIUS SCIPIO (Verona, 1675 - 1755): Di Stefano Manzella I., "Scipione Maffei e l'*Ars critica lapidaria*. Storia e struttura dell' opera", in *Nuovi Studi Maffeiiani. Atti del Convegno Scipione Maffei e il Museo Maffeiiano* (Verona, 1983), pp. 165-186; — vide et infra 5: Calabi Limentani.
- MANCILLA ANTONIUS O.P. (Mexico, 1709-1772): Beuchot M., "La Metafísica de Antonio Mancilla (1709-1772)", *Nova Tellus*, 4 (Mexico, U.N.A.M., 1986), 119-130.
- MANETTUS IANNOTIUS (1396-1469): Dröge Chr., *Giannozzo Manetti als Denker und Hebraist*, *Judentum und Umwelt*, 20 (Frankfurt/M., Bern, New York, P. Lang, 1987).
- MARCHISIUS FRANCISCUS AELIUS (fl. ca. 1500): Bianca Concetta, "Il soggiorno romano di Francesco Elio Marchese", in *De Lisis* (1987), pp. 221-248. Eduntur in appendice *Dedicatio editionis Diogenis Laertii* (1472) ad Oliverium Caraffam Cardinalem et *epistulae* II (Joannes Aloisius Tuscanus [Alvise Toscani] Marchisio; Toscano Marchisius).
- MARNIXIUS SANCTALDEGUNDIUS JACOBUS: Gerlo A., "De onuitgegeven briefwisseling van Marnix van Sint-Aldegonde. Supplement II", in *Academiae Analecta. Mededelingen Kon. Acad. Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België. Klasse der Letteren*, 49 (1987) num. 2, pp. 93-102. *Epistola* 138 (pp. 95-97) a Jacobo die 20 II 1585 Parisiis Philippo patri est data. corrige menda: v. 4 suspicer (non: suspicar); v. 9 Malecontentos; v. 15 Cancellario.
- MARSUS PETRUS: vide PETRUS MARSUS.
- MELANCHTHON PHILIPPUS: Jensen Kr., "The Latin Grammar of Philipp Melanchthon", *ACNG*, pp. 513-520; — Prins J., "The Influence of Agricola and Melanchthon on Hobbes' Early Philosophy of Science", *Agricola*, pp. 293-301.
- MENCKE OTTO: vide 1.6 *sub nomine*.
- MICYLLUS JACOBUS: vide infra: Morata.
- MODELIIUS JOANNES: Früh M., *Johannes Modelius*, *De variis casibus Ittingae. Eine Chronik der Kartause Ittingen*. Herausgegeben und übersetzt, Ittinger Schriftenreihe, 1 (Ittingen, 1985).

- MONGITORE ANTONINUS (Palermo, 1663-1743): Cusimano G., "Sugli *Scriptores Melitenses*, appendice inserita nel rifacimento inedito della *Bibliotheca Sicula* di A. Mongitore", *Journal of Maltese Studies*, 17-18 (1987-88) = *Incontri Siculo-Maltesi. Atti del II Convegno su Malta-Sicilia...* Malta 1986, a cura di G. Brincat, pp. 139-147.
- DE MONTE PETRUS: vide supra 4.1: Quagliioni.
- MORATA OLYMPIA (Ferrara, 1526 - Heidelberg, 26 X 1555): Holzberg N., "Olympia Morata und die Anfänge des griechischen an der universität Heidelberg", *Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, 31 (1987), 77-93. De primordiis studiorum graecorum in universitate Heidelbergensi a Rudolpho Agricola ad Gulielmum Xylandrum. Praeter Moratam copiosius agitur de Jacobo Micyllo; — *Olympia Fulvia Morata. Das Olympia-Morata-Gymnasium und seine Schulpatronin in Bildern und Texten* (Schweinfurt, Olympia-Morata-Gymnasium, 1986); — vide et supra 2.2.
- MORCELLIUS STEPHANUS ANTONIUS (Chiari/Brescia, 17 I 1737 - 1 I 1821): Calabi Limentani I., "Il posto del Morcelli negli studi antiquari", in G. Vavassori, *Catalogo del fondo Stefano Antonio Morcelli*, Regione Lombardia, Fonti e strumenti, 8 (I-20124 Milano, Editrice bibliografica, Viale Vittorio Veneto, 24, 1987), pp. vii-xviii. Commentatio utilissima de Morcellio eiusque opere *De Stilo Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Catalogus bibliothecae Morcellianae in urbe Clarensi (Chiari) etiam studiis neolatinis magni est momenti et utilitatis imprimis ad saec. XVIII quod spectat; — vide et infra 5: Calabi Limentani.
- MORUS THOMAS: Kluxen K., "Thomas Morus und seine Utopia als Wegbereiter moderner Sozialanalyse", in Kindermann U., Maaz W., Wagner Fr. (edd.), *Festschrift für P. Klopsch* (Göppingen, Kümmerle Verlag, 1988), pp. 233-256; — Petersen E., "Sir Thomas More Beheaded. A Preliminary Survey of *Moreana Danica*", in *Jacobsen*, pp. 202-223. Tractantur Henricus Harderus epigrammatographus (1642-1683), Olaus Borrichius historicus, Ludovicus Holbergius fabulator "Potu-anus"; — Sørensen K., "Notes on the First English Translation of More's Utopia", in *Jacobsen*, pp. 326-337; — White Th.I., "Legend and Reality: the Friendship between More and Erasmus", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp. 489-504; — Baumann U., "Logische Exempla und ihre Funktion in der *Responsio ad Lutherum* des Thomas Morus", *ACNG*, pp. 563-572; — McLean A.M., "Thomas More's *Utopia* as Dialogue and City Encomium", *ib.*, pp. 91-98; — Schulte Herbrüggen H., "Artes dictandi und erasmische Theorie in More's lateinischen Briefen", *ib.*, pp. 503-512; — Ribhegge W., "Zur Rolle Thomas Morus': neue Perspektiven", *WRM*, 12 (1988), 94-96; — vide et supra: Erasmus (Dust).
- MOSCHEROSCH JOHANNES MICHAEL: Meuschel K., "Eine unbekannte Dissertatio Moscheroschs: *De amicitia*, 1624", *WBN* 15 (1988), 23-24.
- MURETUS MARCUS ANTONIUS: vide supra: 2.2; 3.2.
- MYLIUS HERMANNUS: Miller L., "Hermann Mylius' Baroque Letters to Milton and Weckherlin", *ACNG*, pp. 233-241.
- NANNIUS PETRUS: vide supra: Beatus Rhenanus.

- NEWTONUS ISACIUS (1643-1727): Hrandek P., "De Newtoni Latinitate", *Hermes Americanus*, 5 (1987), 156-164.
- NICOLAUS CUSANUS: vide supra 1.5: Dionysius Areopagita.
- NICOLAUS MODRUSSIENSIS: McClure G.W., "A Little Known Renaissance Manual of Consolation: Nicolaus Modrussiense's *De Consolatione*, 1465-1466", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp. 247-277.
- NOGAROLA ISOTTA: vide supra 1.5: Consolatio.
- OSIANDER ANDREAS: vide supra: Beatus Rhenanus.
- PALATIOLUS ANTONIUS ("Palazzolo, ca. 1428?): Ronconi G., "L'umanista Antonio Palazzolo discepolo di Guarino e la sua prolusione Padovana 'de laudibus eloquentie'", in *Zaccaria*, pp. 147-167. Editur oratio anno 1453 (?) dicta.
- PANORMITA ANTONIUS: Cataldi Palau Anna Clara, "Il cardinale François de Tournon ed i suoi rapporti con Ludovico Beccadelli ed altri umanisti", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 77-82.
- PEDERSEN CHRISTIANUS: Haastrup N., "When 'Interpretamenta' are translated instead of 'lemmata' or 'Around' a Vicious Circle in *Vocabularium ad usum Dacorum* (1510) by Christiern Pedersen", in *Jacobsen*, pp. 353-366.
- PEROTTUS NICOLAUS: Boldrini S., "L'*Epitome* perottina: 'scoperte' di manoscritti e il codice Bologna, Bibl. Univ., 2948", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 21-28. De codicibus iterum iterumque "inventis"; — Charlet J.-L., "Traductions en vers latins de fragments grecs dans l'*Epitome* de N. Perotti et l'*In calumniatorem Platonis* de Bessarion", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 51-67. Versuum in utroque opere auctor esse videtur Perottus; — Furno Martine, "Un exemple de la méthode de Perotti: présence cachée de Quintilien dans un passage du *Cornucopiae* (Aldine 1526, 132, 31 à 133,9)", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 101-109; — Alessio G.C., "Il *De componendis epistolis* di Niccolò Perotti e l'epistolografia umanistica", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 9-18; — Boldrini S., "Un nuovo testimone di Fedro: la *Cornucopia* del Perotti", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 19-25; — Charlet J.-L. - Furno Martine, "Nicolai Perotti episcopi Sipontini Cornu Copiae seu Linguae Latinae Commentarii. Praefatus est S. Prete", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 271-322. Critice eduntur libri 1ⁱ capp. 1-24 epigrammatis primi Martialis; — Charlet J.-L., "Observations sur certaines éditions du Cornu copiae de Niccolò Perotti (1489-1500)", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 83-96. Laudantur et epigrammata aliquot Joa. Franc. Philomusi, Ant. Constantii, Marci Philoxeni, L. Pontici, Domitii Palladii, Joa. Pompeii Corniani, Dan. Caietani. In appendice editur fragmentum (antea iam divulgatum) Perottianum a Polydoro Vergilio repertum; — Furno Martine, "'Qu'il lui fasse tout passer par l'étamine' (Montaigne, Essais, 1, 26): ou de l'appropriation par Perotti d'un passage des *Elegantiae* de Lorenzo Valla", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 141-153; — Pace Nicola, "La traduzione di Niccolò Perotti delle *Historiae* di Polibio", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 221-234. Comparatur cum Leonardo Bruno.
- PETRARCA FRANCISCUS: Aurigemma M., "Problemi e temi della storia nei *Rerum Memorandarum Libri* di Francesco Petrarca", in *De Lisis* (1987), pp. 109-139; — Blanc P., "De la transgression comme scandale à la

transgression comme idéal: la double image de César dans l'œuvre et la pensée de Pétrarque", in *César*, pp. 35-55; — Braccesi L., *L'Ultimo Alessandro (dagli antichi ai moderni)*, Saggi e materiali universitari, 5ª ser., 4 (Padova, Editoriale Programma, 1986). *Quantum capitulum agit de Alexandro Magno apud Petrarcam (De viris illustribus...)*; — Crevatin Giuliana, "Quid de nocte? Francesco Petrarca e il Sogno del Conquistatore", *Quaderni Petrarqueschi*, 4 (1987), 139-166; — Enenkel K.A.E., "Der andere Petrarca: Francesco Petrarca's *De Vita Solitaria* und die *devotio moderna*", *Quaerendo*, 17 (1987), 137-147; — Id., "'Non statim abiciendi sunt codices'. Präliminarien zu einer kritischen Edition von 'De vita solitaria'", *Quaderni Petrarqueschi*, 4 (1987), 185-204; — Lauwers P., "Vriendschap volgens Petrarca, *Familiarium Rerum* l. IX, 9", *Kleio*, 16 (1986-1987), 97-106; — Van Crombruggen H., "Een voorbeeld van ontleening bij Petrarca", in *Liber amicorum A. Stoop* (Sint-Niklaas, 1987), pp. 155-156. Quomodo Ciceronem sit imitatus in *Vitae Solitariae* dedicatione. — Kallendorf Cr., *Selected Letters of Petrarch*. Bryn Mawr Latin Commentaries (Bryn Mawr, 1986); — vide et 2.2.

PETRUS MARSUS (Cese/Avezzano, ca. 30 X 1441 - Roma, 30 XII 1511): Dykmans M. S.J., *L'Humanisme de Pierre Marso*, Studi e Testi, 327 (Città del Vaticano, 1988). Continet vitam, conspectum operum, Orationem in obitum Pomponii Laeti (1498) et Suasoriam orationem ad sodales (Confraternitatis B.M.V.) habitam in aede Divae Maioris (1499), quae primum in lucem est prolata. Corrigenda quaedam: p. 8, N. 1, v. 4 lege *illam*; distichon non Trinitatem alloquitur, sed Petrum defunctum; p. 16, N. 39, v. 13 lege *prima*, non *propria*; p. 26, N. 74, 1: *niti(di)ssima*; p. 32, N. 95, 1: emenda: *Profitebatur*; p. 44, N. 140, 2 lege *hierarcham*; 10 *et* (pro *er*); 20 *Quid* (pro *Quod*); p. 45, 29 *ad* (pro *as*); p. 45 lege versum primum: *Gaudeo quod te*; quartum: ... *dextrae, l(a)ev(a)e...*; p. 68, 20 lege *officiorum*; p. 97 U, v. 8 lege *perpolitos*; p. 103 ultimo versu lege *desipimus*; p. 104 in altera textus parte, 8 lege *nonnullas*; et in 11 dele (*sic*); p. 107 in altera parte, 7 lege *Disiecte*; p. 111 Iurisprudens ignotus est Pomponius, libro XV^o ad Sabinum (*Dig. XXIV 3.1*). (J. IJ.)

PHAEDRA / PHAEDRUS: vide supra: Inghiramus.

PHILELPHUS FRANCISCUS: Bessi Rossella, "Sul Commento di Francesco Filelfo ai 'Rerum Vulgarium Fragmenta'", *Quaderni Petrarqueschi*, 4 (1987), 229-270; — Maltese E.V., "Osservazioni critiche sul testo dell'epistolario greco di Francesco Filelfo", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 207-213; — vide et supra 1.5: Consolatio (quod spectat etiam Marium Philelphum).

PICUS MIRANDULANUS JOANNES: vide supra 1.5: Dionysius Areopagita.

PIGHIVS SEBASTIANUS: Fowler D.P., "Notes on Pighius and Valerius Maximus", *Classical Quarterly*, N.S., 38 (1988), 262-264.

PLATINA BARTHOLOMAEUS: *Bartolomeo Sacchi Il Platina (Piadena 1421 - Roma 1481)*. *Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi per il V Centenario (Cremona, 14-15 novembre 1981)*. A cura di A. Campana e Paola Medioli Masotti, Medioevo e Umanesimo, 62 (Padova, Antenore, 1986); — Ruyschaert J., "La Bibliothèque Vaticane dans les dix premières années du

- pontificat de Sixte IV", *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae*, 24 (1986), 71-90; — vide et infra: Scala Bartholomaeus.
- POGGIUS BRACCIOLINUS: *Lettere*, III: *Epistolarum familiarium libri, secundum volumen*. A cura di Helene Harth (Firenze, Olschki, 1987); — Davies M.C., *Friends and Enemies of Poggio* (Ph. D. Diss., Oxford, 1986); — Merisalo O., "Le prime edizioni stampate del *De varietate fortunae* di Poggio Bracciolini, II", *Arctos. Acta Philologica Fennica*, 20 (1986), 101-129; — Pittaluga St., "Poggio fra Cicerone ed 'exempla'", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 267-274. Agitur de Facetiis.
- POLENTONUS SICCO: Fabbri Renata, "Un esempio della tecnica compositiva del Polenton: la *Vita Senecae* (*Script. Ill. Lat. Ling.*, lib. XVII)", *RPL*, 10 (1987), 85-92.
- POLITIANUS ANGELUS: Angelo Poliziano, *Commento inedito alle Satire di Persio*, a cura di Lucia Cesarini Martinelli e R. Ricciardi (Firenze, Olschki, 1985); — Galand Perrine, "La poétique latine d'Ange Politien: de la *Mimésis* à la métatextualité", *Latomus*, 47 (1988), 146-155; — Wolters A., "Poliziano as a Translator of Plotinus", *RQ*, 40 (1987), 452-464; — vide et 2.2.
- POMPONATIUS PETRUS: Van Dooren W., "The *Artes* at Ferrara: Pomponazzi and Agricola", *Agricola*, pp. 248-256.
- PONTANUS JOANNES JOVIANUS: Deramaix M., "Excellentia et admiratio dans l'*Actius* de Giovanni Pontano. Une poétique et une esthétique de la perfection", *MEFRM*, pp. 171-212; — Monti Sabia L., "Una lettera inedita di Giovanni Pontano", *IMU*, 29 (1986), 165-188. — vide et 2.2.
- POSSEVINUS ANTONIUS S.J.: Donnelly J.P., S.J., "Antonio Possevino's Tribute to Edmund Campion", *Archivum Histor. Societatis Iesu*, 57 (1988), 163-169. Primum editur Possevini responsum ad *The Execution of Justice in England* (XII 1583) de martyrio Edmundi Campion et aliorum sociorum Iesu, Londini 1581.
- POSTEL GULIELMUS: *Postello, Venezia e il suo mondo*, Civiltà Veneziana, Saggi, 36 (Firenze, Olschki, 1988); — Leathers Kunz M., "The Myth of Venice in the Thought of Guillaume Postel", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp. 505-523; — Ead., "Angela da Foligno e la Vergine di Venezia. Un paradigma della spiritualità nel Cinquecento", *RPL*, 11 (1988), 175-182; — Ead., "The Commentary of Guillaume Postel on the Sibylline Verses of Vergil: An Example of a Renaissance Reading of the Classics", *ACNG*, pp. 81-90; — vide et infra: Weill.
- RAGENAU FRANCISCUS S.J. (Blois, 13 I 1598 - Bourges, 10 IV 1665): *Monumenta historica missionis Novae Franciae ab anno 1607 ad 1637*, in L. Campeau S.J., *Monumenta Novae Franciae*, vol. III: *Fondation de la mission huronne (1635-1637)*, Monumenta historica S.J., 130 (Roma, Québec, 1987), pp. 409-463. Editio princeps.
- RAMUS PETRUS (Cuts, 1515 - Paris, 1572): *Arguments in Rhetoric Against Quintilian*. Translation and Text of Peter Ramus's *Rhetoricae Distinctiones in Quintilianum* (1549). Translation by Carole Newlands, Introduction by J.J. Murphy (Northern Illinois U.P., De Kalb, Illinois, 1986); — Dubois Cl.-G., "César et Ramus" in *César*, pp. 109-118. Agitur de libris *De*

- moribus veterum Gallorum et De Caesaris militia*; — Meerhoff C.G., “Agricola et Ramus - dialectique et rhétorique”, *Agricola*, pp. 270-280.
- RAYMUNDUS (FLAVIUS MITHRIDATES) GULIELMUS DE MONCATA (Agrigento, ca. 1455? - post 1489): Lippincott K. - Pingree D., “Ibn-al-Hâtîm on the Talismans of the Lunar Mansions”, *Journal of Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 50 (1987), 57-81. Editur e codice Vat. lat. 1384 Raymundi *de imaginibus celestibus Ali ibn il Haytim traductio* ad Fredericum ducem Urbini.
- RESENDIUS ANDREAS: André de Resende, *Carta a Bartolomeu de Quevedo*. Introdução, texto latino, versão e notas de Virgínia Soares Pereira, *Textos humanísticos Portugueses*, 5 (Universidade de Coimbra, Centro de Estudos Clássicos e Humanísticos, 1988). Editur, vertitur et copiose illustratur *Epistola ad Bartholomaeum Kebedium, sanctae Toletanae ecclesiae sacerdotem, virum doctissimum (1567)* de rebus Lusitanicis historicis, archaeologicis, etc. Additae sunt imagines photographicae editionis principis. — vide et 2.2.
- REUCHLIN JOHANNES (Pforzheim 29 I 1455 - Stuttgart 30 VI 1522): Rhein St., “Reuchliniana, I: Neue Bausteine zur Biographie Johannes Reuchlins”, *WRM* 12 (1988), 84-94. Nota diem natalem et obitus locum!
- SALUTATUS COLUCCIUS: vide supra 1.5: Vergilius (Brown; Fisher).
- SAMBUCUS JOHANNES: vide 1.2: Hungaria (Téglásy).
- SANCHEZ FRANCISCUS (Tuy, 1550 - Toulouse, 1632): *Franciscus Sanchez: That Nothing is Known*. Edited by Elaine Limbrick and D.F.S. Thomson (Cambridge U.P., 1988). Editio critica, interpretatio anglica, introductio et adnotationes tractatus q.i. *Quod nihil scitur* (Lugduni, 1581; Francofurti, 1618; Roterodami, 1649). Liber prodibit exeunte anno 1988.
- SCALA BARTHOLOMAEUS: Brown Alison, “Scala, Platina and Lorenzo de’ Medici in 1474”, in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp. 327-337. Eduntur epistolae tres Scalae, i.a. de dialogo Platinae *de optimo cive*. In 3^a epistula legas v. 6 “ad scribendum”; v. 8 legendum videtur “ingurgitor”; v. 22 legendum “diuidicare”.
- SCALIGER JULIUS CAESAR: Reineke Ilse, “Macrobius, Saturnalien Buch 5 und Julius Caesar Scaliger, Poetik Buch 5, Kapitel 3. Der Vergleich von Homer und Vergil”, *RPL*, 10 (1987), 275-295; — vide et supra 2.1.: Reineke.
- SECUNDINUS NICOLAUS: vide supra 1.5: Consolatio.
- SIGONIUS CAROLUS: McCuaig W., “Carlo Sigonio storico e la censura”, *Atti e memorie Deputazione di storia patria per le provincie di Romagna*, N.S., 35 (1984 [Bologna, 1986]), 163-193; — Id., “Rescrivere Cicerone: Carlo Sigonio e la *Consolatio Ciceronis* del 1583”, in Mazzacurati G.C. - Plaisance M. (edd.), *Scritture di Scritture: Testi, generi, modelli nel Rinascimento*, Europa delle Corti..., Biblioteca del Cinquecento, 36 (Roma, Bulzoni, 1987), pp. 207-215.
- SOCINUS FAUSTUS (Siena 1539 - Ludlawice 1604): Chomarat J., “Fausto Sozzini source du Pari de Pascal?”, *ACNG*, pp. 587-608.
- SNOY REINERUS (Gouda, ca. 1477 - I VIII 1537): de Hemptinne Suzanne, *Uitgave, vertaling en studie van Reynerus Snoy Goudanus (ca. 1477-1537)*,

- De rebus Batavicis libri XIII, *boek II* (Diss. licent. inedita; Leuven, 1988). Editio libri II¹, cuius fons praecipuus est Annii Viterbiensis.
- SOUPHERUS GERVASIUS: vide supra 2.2.
- SPELRLING OTTO JR. (København, 1634 - 1715): Alenius Marianne: "Love at first (w)ink. A Fragment of Otto Sperling's Neolatin Correspondence", in *Jacobsen*, pp.164-184. De epistolis eius ad mulieres datis, imprimis ad Sophiam Elisabeth Brenner Suecanam.
- SPINOZA BARUCH: Carson M.Th., "Spinoza on the Power and Eternity of the Intellect", in *Suppl. Kristeller*, pp. 598-610.
- STURMIUS JOANNES: vide supra: Agricola (Nikolaou).
- SYLVESTER JANUS: vide 1.2: Hungaria (Téglásy).
- TRAPEZUNTIUS GEORGIUS: vide supra 1.5: Consolatio.
- TRAVERSANUS LAURENTIUS GULIELMUS: De *Epitoma Margarite castigate Eloquentie* anno 1986 a R.H. Martin critice edita (vide *HL*, 36 (1987), 334) iudicium protulit lectu dignum Silvia Rizzo, "A proposito dell' edizione di un testo latino del Quattrocento", *Rivista di Filologia e Istruzione classica*, 116 (1988), 241-249.
- TIRAQUELLUS ANTONIUS: Laingui A., *Le De Poenis temperandis de Tiraqueau (1559)* (Paris, Economica, 1986).
- TORTELLIUS JOANNES: vide supra 1.5: Vergilius (Brown).
- TOSCANUS JOANNES ALOISIUS: vide supra: Marchisius.
- TRIPS FRANCISCUS XAVERIUS (Köln, 30 III 1630 - Bad Honnef, 16 IV 1696): *Franz Xaver Trips. Honnef vor 1700. Aufzeichnungen zur Ortsgeschichte*. Herausgegeben von E. Nellessen (Bad Honnef, 1978). Eduntur cum interpretatione germanica "Ephemerides sive Diarium consuetudinum et obligationum Ecclesiae Honneffensis" (1691); "Exactissima instructio omnium earum rerum quas novisse pastoris quam maxime interest" (1692); "Succincta et laconica exustae et omnibus per Gallos Bonnenses exutae communitatis Honneffensis enarratio" (1692). Sequitur elenchus operum Tripsianorum, quorum permulta poetica ("Querela et suspirium urbis Bonnae", ca. 1673-84; "Bonna lamentans", etc.).
- TRITHEMIUS JOANNES (Tritenheim, 1 II 1462 - Würzburg, 13 XII 1516): De *origine gentis Francorum compendium. An Abridged History of the Franks*. The Latin Text with an English Translation, Introduction and Notes by M. Kuelbs (†) and R.P. Sonkowsky, *Bibliotheca germanica*, 4 (Dudweiler, AQ-Verlag, 1987); — Glidden Hope H., "Polygraphia and the Renaissance Sign: the Case of Trithemius", *Neophilologus*, 71 (1987), 183-195.
- TURGENEV IVAN (1818-1883): Wes M.A., "Toergenjev op weg langs de Oudheid", *Hermeneus*, 60 (1988), 15-23. Tradit specimina Latina, quae auctor Russicus composuit anno 1842, cum Petropoli examina subiret ad gradum magistri adipiscendum.
- UBBO EMMIUS: von Reeken E., *Ubbo Emmius, Friesische Geschichte*, vol. 7: *Geschichte unserer Zeit, 1592-1608* (Frankfurt/M., 1986).
- URSINUS FULVIUS: Ruyschaert J., "Fulvio Orsini, son père, ses prénoms et les Orsini de Mugnano", *MEFRM*, pp.213-229. Adfertur i.a. *Vita Fulvii Ursini* a Iosepho Castiglione Romae anno 1657 edita.

URSINUS JORDANUS: vide supra 4.1.: Quaglioni.

VALERIANUS PIERIUS: Gaissier, Julia Haig, "The Catullan Lectures of Pierius Valerianus", *ACNG*, pp. 45-54.

VALLA LAURENTIUS: *Ueber den freien Willen - De libero arbitrio. Lateinisch-deutsche Ausgabe* von E. Kessler (München, Fink, 1987); — Antonazzi G., *Lorenzo Valla e la polemica sulla donazione di Costantino, con testi inediti dei secoli XV-XVII*, Uomini e dottrine, 28 (Roma, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1985). Eduntur Antonii Cortesi *Antivalla* (pp. 195-206); Petri H(a)edi *In Laurentii Vallae libellum famosum quemdam Antidotum* (pp. 213-244); Zachariae de Rhodigio *De donatione Constantini* (pp. 245-267); Hieronymi Fusci *De donatione Constantini* (pp. 269-310), opusculum scriptum lingua italo-latina mixta; — Ruelle P., *Les Apologues de Guillaume Tardif et les Facetiae Morales de Laurent Valla*, Centre d'études franco-italien Universités de Turin et de Savoie, Textes et études: domaine français, 10 (Genève, Paris, Slatkine, 1986); — Struever Nancy, "Lorenzo Valla's Grammar of Subject and Object. An Ethical Inquiry", in *I Tatti Studies. Essays in the Renaissance*, 2 (Firenze, Villa I Tatti, 1987), pp. 239-267; — Turnberg T.O., "The Latinity of Lorenzo Valla's *Gesta Ferdinandi regis Aragonum*", *HL*, 37 (1988), 30-78; — vide et supra 1.5: Dionysius Areopagita; 4.2. Perottus (Furno).

VAN COUDENBERGHE PETRUS (Antwerpen?, 1520? - saec. XVI exeunte): Vandewiele L.J., "Peeter van Coudenberghe door de historici mis-behandeld", in *Academiae Analecta. Mededelingen Kon Acad. Wetensch., Lett. en Schone Kunsten van België. Klasse der Wetenschappen*, 49 (1988), num. 2, pp. 37-49. Emendantur varii errores biographici. Petrus pharmacopola et botanicus edidit, correxit et illustravit *Dispensatorium Valerii Cordi*.

VÁSQUEZ DIONYSIUS (Toledo, 2/3 VI 1479 - 1 VII 1539): Stöhr J., "Neuaufgefundene Bibelerklärungen des ersten Exegeten der Universität von Alcalá, Dionysius Vásquez (1479-1539)", *Augustiniana*, 37 (1987), 279-316. Praemittitur vita et operum conspectus. Sequuntur fragmenta e codice 1208 regiae bibliothecae Melitensis Valettanae prolata.

VERBIEST FERDINANDUS S.J.: Golvers N. - Libbrecht U., *Astronom van de Keizer. Ferdinand Verbiest en zijn Europese Sterrenkunde* (Leuven, Davidsfonds, 1988). Interpretatio nederlandica *Astronomiae Europaeae* (Dilingae, 1687) cum introductione historico-biographica; — Libbrecht U., "Het wetenschappelijk werk van Ferdinand Verbiest", *Onze Alma Mater*, 41 (Leuven, 1987), 309-324. De doctis operibus Verbiesti, quae partim latine scripta sunt apud Seres: *Astronomia Europaea* (Dilingae, 1687), de variis disciplinis physicis: quo in libro (pp. 87-88) primus currus describitur vaporis vi motus et ab auctore anno 1668 in aula regia Sinensi aedificatus; — vide et supra: Ioannes III Sobieski.

VERGERIUS PETRUS PAULUS SENIOR: vide supra 1.5: Vergilius (Fisher).

VICUS JOANNES BAPTISTA: De Franciscis A., "Giambattista Vico e le catacombe napoletane", in *Sodalitas. Studi in onore di Antonio Guarino*, vol. 8 (Napoli, Jovene, 1984), pp. 3945-3954. Agitur de "Principum Neapolitanorum coniurationis anni 1701 historia"; — Uscatescu G., "Actualité et perennité de Vico", *Bulletin Association G. Budé*, 1987, 360-371.

- VIVES JOANNES LUDOVICUS: Coppens Chr., "Une collaboration inconnue entre Caroline Guillard et Hugues de La Porte en 1544: le *De Civitate Dei* d'Augustin édité par Juan Luis Vives", *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch*, 1988, 126-140. Continet in appendice elenchum editionum DCD annorum 1522-1622; — Del Nero V., "Recenti studi su Juan Luis Vives (1970-1985)", *Cultura e Scuola*, num. 102 (Aprile-giugno 1987), 121-141; — González y González E., *Joan Lluís Vives. De la Escolastica al Humanismo* (Valencia, Generalitat Valenciana, 1987); — George E.V., "The Sullan Declamations: Vives' Intentions", *ACNG*, pp. 55-62; — Matheeußen C., "Das Ringen des J.L. Vives um eine humanistische Bildung: 1514-1519", *ACNG*, pp. 653-658; — vide et supra: Erasmus (Dust).
- WEILL GEORGIUS: *Vie et caractère de Guillaume Postel, par G. Weill*. Traduction du latin et mise à jour par Fr. Secret (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1987).
- WERNER JOHANNES (Nürnberg 14 II 1468 - V(?) 1522): Bäumer Anne, "Johannes Werners Abhandlung 'Über die Bewegung der achten Sphäre' (De motu octavae sphaerae, Nürnberg 1522)", *WRM* 12 (1988), 49-61. Auctrix criticam editionem parat.
- ZACHARIAS DE RHODIGIO: vide supra: Valla (Antonazzi).

5. INSCRIPTIONES

- Calabi Limentani Ida, "Note su classificazione ed indici epigrafici dallo Smezio al Morcelli: antichità, retorica, critica", *Epigraphica*, 49 (1987), 177-202. Tractat non solum inscriptionum editores sed etiam scriptores de arte epigraphica sicut Scipionem Maffei et Stephanum Ant. Morcellium.
- Jacquot J., "Dilemmes posés par des médailles sur le rôle joué par le père Claude-François Ménestrier sous le règne de Louis XIV", in *JESU*, pp. 481-489.
- Neumüllers-Klausner Renate iudicium protulit de Actis epigraphicis Luneburgensibus (*Deutsche Inschriften. Fachtagung für mittelalterliche und neuzeitliche Epigraphik Lüneburg 1984* [Göttingen, 1986]), *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 239 (1987), 296-308.
- BOLOGNA: Sanders G., *Perennità del messaggio epigrafico dalla comunità tardaantica ai lettori dello Studio Bolognese*, Conferenze di Ateneo (Bologna, Editrice Clueb, 1988).
- BRUGGE: Marc'hadour G., "Thomas More dans l'histoire de Bruges", *Moreana*, 25 num. 97 (1988), 105-110. Eduntur inscriptiones II funebres Mariae Augustinae More (Eboraci, 1 IV 1732 - Brugis, 23 III 1807), quae erat "superiorissa" conventus anglici (Brugensis) Canonicarum Augustinianarum.
- EBERBACH IM RHEINGAU: Monsees Yvonne, "Entwicklung und Typologie der Abtsgrabplatten im Zisterzienserkloster Eberbach", *Mainzer Zeitschrift*, 82 (1987), 25-37.
- GRONINGEN: Edskes C.H., "Rudolph Agricola and the Organ of the *Martinker* in Groningen", *Agricola*, pp. 112-117. Exhibet titulum in organo ecclesiae S. Martini inscriptum.

- OPPENHEIM: Düll Siegrid, "Vom alten sollst du behalten was gut ist und schön. Oppenheimer Inschriften des 18. Jahrhunderts", *Mainzer Zeitschrift*, 82 (1987), 71-99. Supplementum corporis Oppenheimensis: S. Düll, *Die Inschriften der Stadt Oppenheim* (Wiesbaden, 1984).
- VALLADOLID: Bravo Lozano M., Rodrigo Aragon Carolina, Calleja García Alicia, "La inscripcion-epitafio latino de la Iglesia de la Magdalena de Valladolid en memoria del obispo de Palencia, don Pedro de Lagasca", in *Actas del I congreso de historia de Palencia*, vol. IV (Diputación Provincial de Palencia, 1986), pp. 93-101.
- ROMA: Gatz E., *Der Campo Santo Teutonico in Rom und seine Grabdenkmäler* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, Herder, 1988).
- SINT-TRUIDEN: *De blijde intrede van Abt Eucherius Knaepen te Sint-Truiden (1791)*, Mededelingen van het Centrum voor studie van de Boerenkrijg, 100 (Hasselt, Provinciaal Archief- en Documentatiecentrum, 1982). Laetus introitus abbatis Trudonopolitani inscriptionibus et acclamationibus ornatus; libellus photographice denuo expressus.
- Vide et supra 1.8.: Gruber.

6. LATINITAS NOVISSIMA

- Certamen Capitolinum. Series altera*, IIII: MDCCCCLXXXVI (Roma, Ist. di Studi Romani, 1986). Continet carmina duo: Aloisii Carta *Occasum Urbis* (carmen polymetrum) et Angeli Sarraco *Mirum Asseclam Phoebi* (heroicum).
- Commentarii Academiae Latinitati Fovendae*, XI: St. Borzsák, C. Gantar, P. Grimal, I. Irmscher, S. Ritoók, V. Ussani, M. von Albrecht, *De philosophiae, epicae poesis et historiae initiis apud Romanos* (Roma, Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani, 1988), 84 pp.
- IMMÉ-MÉTAIS GENOVEFA: Gai a Maupassant *quid venale fuerit*. Latine convertit G.I. (Mazet St Voy, 1987). Fabella picta.
- MIZUNO ARITUNEUS: "P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber primus ab Arituneo Mizuno poeta emendatus", *The Annual Report of Researches of Otani University*, 40 (Otani, Japan, 1987), 1-59. Aeneidos lib. I ad normam semi-Ovidianam redactus.
- MORABITO JOSEPHUS: "Cuiusdam civis laetitia (con traduzione in versi)", *Memorie e Rendiconti dell'Acc. di Sc., Lett. e Belle Arti degli Zelanti e dei Dafnici di Acireale*, S. III, 7 (1987), 238-251; — "Er (con traduzione di S. Stella)", *Helikon*, 22-27 (1982-1987), 490-515. Carmina II, quorum posterius legitur etiam inter carmina poetae collecta (*Latina Fides*, Mediolani, 1979).
- PAVANETTO CLETUS: *Elementa linguae et grammaticae Latinae* (Roma, Libreria Aten. Salesiano, 1987). Editio altera auctor et emendatior.
- PEKKANEN THOMAS: vide supra 1.2: Fennia (Sacré).
- SARMIENTO RAIMUNDUS C.M.F. (Cordoba/Argentina, 1914): Sacré Th., "R, Sarmiento, Atomicum fulmen", *Giornale filologico ferrarese*, 10

- (1987), 147-149. Carmen pythiambicum primum editur, nota adiuncta bibliographica.
- STROH VALAHFRIDUS: *Amor in monte docto* (Frisingae, 1987). Fabula prosimetrica acta ineuntibus Ludis Latinis (Frisingensibus, a° 1987); — *De Latinis litteris hoc tempore docendis. Oratio m. Febr. A.D. MCMLXXXVIII in Collegio Cancellarii Zombensi Universitatis Malavinae et in Academia Kamuzu prope urbem Kasungu habita* (München, Inst. für klass. Philol. der Univ., 1988). Oratio edita est cum interpretatione anglica; — vertit Horst Frihðalavum, “De Fausto artium bonarum novatore”, *Literatur in Bayern*, 1987, num. 10, 26-27.
- TUSIANI JOSEPHUS: *La parola difficile: Autobiografia di un italo-americano*, La casa rossa, 3 (Fasano, Schena editore, 1988). Attinguntur hic illic versus eius latini; — Bandiera E., “Una pagina di poesia latina di Joseph Tusiani”, *Nuovo Confronto*, 2, num. 10-11 (Bari, 1987), 6.
- ULRICHS CAROLUS: Browne D., *Haegar terribilis miles sine timore vitiisque* (Latine vertit Ulrichs) (München, Goldmann, 1986).
- VISCIDO LAURENTIUS: *Poematia* (Soveria Mannelli, Calabria Letteraria Edit., 1987). Editio altera emendatior.
- WALKER E.P.: *Fabula de Petro Cuniculo. Liber omnibus notus Beatricis Potter in Latinum conversus est auctore E.P. Walker* (Harmondsworth, 1987).
- WEIS JOANNES: *Bella Bulla: Lateinische Sprachspielereien*, Dümmlerbuch, 4701 (Bonn, 1985⁷).
- Vide et supra 2.1: Devoldere.

* * *

Absolutum exeunte mense Augusto MCMLXXXVIII.

INSTRUMENTUM LEXICOGRAPHICUM

NOVA LEXICA

- *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, vol. X 2, fasc. V: Praefiguro — Praepotens (Lipsiae, Teubner, 1987).
- *Glossarium Mediae Latinitatis Sueciae*, vol. II, fasc. 2: Micchi — Officialitas (Holmiae 1987).
- *Lexicon Latinitatis Medii Aevi Hungariae*, vol. I, fasc. 1: A/Ab/Abs — Aeternaliter (Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1987).
- *Lexicon Latinitatis Nederlandicae Medii Aevi*, vol. IV (F), fasc. 27-28: Fidelitas — Gedaco (Leiden, Brill, 1987); 29: Gello-Guva (1988).
- *Lexicon Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis Polonorum*, vol. V, fasc. 46-48: Maternalis — Necessitas (Cracoviae, 1987).

*
* * *

- Mariucci T., *Latinitatis Nova et Vetera. De Romani sermonis virtute*. Vol. 1: A-B (Città del Vaticano, 1986). Novum lexicon Italo-latinum ad exemplum lexi Bacciani.
- *Melissae Lexicon minus Latinitatis modernae Latino-theodiscum / Theodisco-latinum* (Bruxellis, Domus ed. "Fundatio Melissa" [Tervurenlaan 76, B-1040 Brussel, Belgium], 1988).
- Ladan Tom. (Red.), *Osmojezični enciklopedijski Rječnik hrvatski ili srpski, ruski, engleski, njemački, francuski, talijanski, španjolski, latinski*. Vol. I, A - E (Zagreb, Jugoslavenski Leksikografski Zavod "Miroslav Krleža", 1987). Lexicon multilingue: singula verba croato-serbica vertuntur rossice, anglice, germanice, franco-gallice, italice, hispanice et latine. Latinas interpretationes faciendas curavit Vl. Vratović.

INDEX VERBORUM RECENTIORUM

Sequuntur verba, quae neque in *Thesaurο Linguae Latinae* neque in *Lexico Totius Latinitatis* Forcelliniano reperiuntur. Ea autem, quae in lexicis et glossariis Mediae et recentioris Latinitatis leguntur, stellula (*) notavimus. Hunc in indicem denuo non rettulimus vocabula Erasmiana pp. 274-275 ordine alphabetico recensita.

- | | |
|---|--|
| *Admiratus = <i>admiral</i> : p. 53 | Moricanus: p. 123 |
| *Ammiraldus = <i>admiral</i> : p. 198 | *Nymbrifer = <i>imbrifer</i> : p. 123 |
| Anormis = <i>abnormis</i> : p. 265 | *Papicola: p. 295 |
| *Appicare = <i>to arrive by land</i> : p. 42 | *Parlamentum: p. 43, 198 |
| Araldus (= <i>Heraldus</i>): p. 53 | Parricidius quaestor = <i>scultetus</i> : p. 198 |
| *Bombarda = <i>cannon</i> : p. 52 | Patefactor (<i>mysterii</i>): p. 291 |
| *Canonicus: p. 249 | Plebivorus = <i>Δημοφάγος</i> : p. |
| *Carminifex: p. 295. | Plurative = <i>using the plural</i> : p. 202 |
| *Carruca = <i>pulley</i> : p. 42 | *Portio = <i>property, revenue</i> : p. 53 |
| Crudivorus = <i>ὠμοφάγος</i> : p. | Praegustamentum: p. 98 |
| *Dacia = <i>Denmark</i> : p. 252 | Propriissimus (<i>superlative of proprius</i>): |
| Dispectoratus = <i>bare-breasted</i> : p. 53 | p. 94 |
| Dormitritio: p. 140 | Quaestor: <i>vide</i> Parricidius |
| Dux aulicus = <i>court steward</i> : p. 197 | *Quidditas (<i>a philosophical term</i>): p. 19 |
| Eques auratus = <i>knight</i> : p. 198 | *Reddituarius = <i>quaestor aerarius</i> : p. 198 |
| Eradiare: p. 180, 193 | *Scultetus = <i>bailiff</i> : p. 198 |
| Fatipotens: p. 245 | Serpentiger stipes: p. 292 |
| Fragmentatus: p. 215 | *Simeus = <i>simus</i> : p. 117-118. |
| Gnathonismus = <i>excessive flattery</i> : p. 201 | Subdormitare: p. 53. |
| Guesius = <i>geus (Beggar)</i> : p. 259 | Subrequirere: p. 53. |
| *Heraldus: p. 198 | Superiorissa: p. 323 |
| Hosterium = <i>Royal palace</i> : p. 53 | Traiectum Superius = <i>Maastricht</i> : p. 272 |
| Hydriala = <i>holy-water basin</i> : p. 53 | Trialogus: p. 17 |
| Imprimere = <i>to print</i> : p. 179 | Vasylographus = <i>royal writing</i> : p. 19 |
| Incandens = <i>incendens</i> : p. 128 | Vegrandiloquentia: p. 295 |
| Legitmatio: p. 53 | Ventifer: p. 295 |
| *Locumtenens = <i>vicarius</i> : p. 198 | Voscitator = <i>who uses 'vos' instead of 'tu'</i> : |
| *Marchio: p. 191 | p. 202 |

INDICES

1. INDEX CODICUM MANU SCRIPTORUM

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Cambridge, <i>University Library</i>, <i>Ms. Addit.</i> 6676: p. 312</p> <p>Escorial, <i>N. III</i> 7: p. 3</p> <p>Eton College, <i>Ms. 137</i>: p. 17, 21</p> <p>Firenze, <i>Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana</i>, 38.24: p. 216, 233; 64.4/79.7/79.11: p. 4</p> <p>Firenze, <i>Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale</i>, <i>Magl. XVI</i> 67: p. 20</p> <p>Firenze, <i>Biblioteca Riccardiana</i>, 1154: p. 15; 1166: p. 9</p> <p>Firenze, <i>Archivio di Stato</i>, <i>M.A.P. XI.471</i>: p. 15; <i>LXXXIX.287</i>: p. 6</p> <p>Glasgow, <i>University Library</i>, <i>Ferguson 13</i>: p. 19, 20, 21</p> <p>Imotski, <i>Franciscan Monastery</i>, <i>Cicero miscell.</i>, <i>s.N.</i>: p. 4</p> <p>London, <i>British Library</i>, <i>Add. 33782</i>: p. 7</p> <p>London, <i>Id.</i>, <i>Harl. 2493</i>: p. 46; <i>5248</i>: pp. 4-5</p> <p>Milano, <i>Biblioteca Trivulziana</i>, 761: p. 15</p> | <p>Oxford, <i>Bodleian Library</i>, <i>Auct. F.6.27</i>: p. 233</p> <p>Oxford, <i>Id.</i>, <i>Canon. Misc. 109</i>: p. 20</p> <p>Oxford, <i>Brasenose College</i>, 18: p. 242</p> <p>Paris, <i>Bibliothèque nationale</i>, <i>ms. lat. 6174</i>: p. 31, 72; 7903 et 16235: p. 233</p> <p>Sevilla, <i>Biblioteca Colombina</i>, 5-6-22: p. 20</p> <p>Vaticano, <i>latinus 3226</i>: p. 212, 219, 242, 243; 3237: p. 4; 3252: p. 212, 214; 3868: p. 216, 233, 241, 242; 6234: p. 19</p> <p>Vaticano, <i>Ottob. lat. 1984</i>: p. 12, 13, 15</p> <p>Vaticano, <i>Palat. lat. 1486</i>: p. 8; 1496: p. 6</p> <p>Vaticano, <i>ASV, Reg. 424</i>: p. 17; 984; p. 256</p> <p>Venezia, <i>Biblioteca Marciana</i>, <i>lat. XIV 245 (4682)</i>: pp. 17-18</p> <p>Venezia, <i>Archivio di Stato</i>, <i>Procuratori di S. Marco de Citra, B 96</i>: p. 12</p> <p>Vicenza, <i>Biblioteca Capitolare</i>, 128: p. 15</p> <p>Wien, <i>Österreichische Nationalbibliothek</i>, <i>lat. 3420</i>: p. 15</p> |
|---|--|

*
* * *

Vide et codicum manu scriptorum elenchum commentationi Martini C. Davies sub-
textum, pp. 25-27.

2. INDEX NOMINUM SELECTORUM

- Adolphus Burgundius, Dominus Veriensis: 177
- Aeneas Silvius: 14, 82, 86, 187, 196, 197, 198
- Aeolicus, Petrus: 107
- Aeschines: 26, 183
- Aesticampus, Rhagius, Joh.: 107
- Agricola, Rudolfus: 84, 85, 87-92, 96, 97, 99, 106, 108, 111, 113
- Alabantus Antonius: 259, 261
- Alardus Amstelredamus: 89, 91, 118, 119
- Alciatus, Andreas: 247
- Alcuinus: 161
- Alexander de Villadei: 84, 94, 186, 191
- Alfonsus V: 16, 30, 31
- Alfonsus de Cartagena: 11
- Ambergau, Adamus de -: 214
- Ambrosius: 94, 136
- Ammonius (Arena) Andreas: 255-264
- Andreas Bernardus: 260, 261, 264
- Andreas Constantinopolitanus: 10, 11
- Andrelinus, Faustus: 122, 153, 155, 187, 188, 197, 209
- Anthologia Latina*: 159
- Aphani, Petreius: 253
- Appianus: 90
- Apuleius: 36
- Arena: *vide* Ammonius
- Aretinus, Iohannes: 1-29
- Aristoteles: 10, 11, 26, 255
- Arriginus: 83
- Arrigis, Ludovicus de -: 21
- Arrigis, Paulus Cornelius de -: 21
- Asconius, Pedianus: 106
- Astmann, Johannes: 102
- Augustinus: 27, 33
- Aurispia, Johannes: 9, 12, 14
- Ausonius: 142
- Avitus: 136
- Badius, Jodocus: 175, 185, 186, 187, 189, 190, 191, 192, 194, 204, 260
- Baratella, Antonius: 21
- Barbarus, Franciscus: 4, 7, 14, 15, 25, 26
- Barbarus, Hermolaus: 4, 7, 26, 87, 211, 212, 213, 217, 218, 220, 222
- Barbirius, Petrus: 188, 194
- Barbirius, Petrus, jr.: 194
- Barbirianus, Jacobus: 88, 89, 90, 91
- Barzizza, Gasparinus: 14, 85
- Battus, Jacobus: 177, 188, 198
- Bebel, Henricus: 80, 84, 100, 101, 102, 175, 180
- Bellum Africanum*: 38
- Bembus, Bernardus: 17, 20, 21, 22, 212, 214, 215, 242
- Bembus, Giambettus: 211
- Bembus, Petrus: 184, 211-243
- Benedictus Philologus: 240, 241
- Beroaldus, Philippus, sr.: 97, 103
- Bertulphus, Hilarius: 253
- Bessarion: 11
- Blommaert, Jacobus: 259
- Blondus, Flavius: 14
- Blount, William (Lord Mountjoy): 177
- Boccaccius, Iohannes: 117, 138
- Boerius, Iohannes Baptista: 186, 261
- Boethius: 135, 145, 173
- Boler, Martinus: 108
- Bollanus Candianus: 17, 18, 19, 20
- Bollanus, Franciscus: 20
- Brant, Sebastianus: 100, 103
- Bruno, Christoph: 92
- Brunus, Leonardus: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 25, 26, 27, 58, 86
- Budaeus, Guilielmus: 53, 87
- Busleydius, Aegidius: 247
- Busleydius, Aegidius, jr.: 247
- Busleydius, Nicolaus: 247

- Caesar, C. Iulius: 26, 33, 35, 37, 38, 41, 43, 44, 48, 49, 55, 66, 70
 Caesarius, Johannes: 91
 Campanus, Iohannes Antonius: 198
 Campanus Papiensis: 198
 Campegius, Laurentius: 252
 Carbo, Ludovicus: 85, 88
 Carolus V: 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254
 Catullus: 104, 140, 191
 Celtis, Conradus: 84, 91, 92, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105, 108
 Cenni, Giovanni di -, *vide*: Aretinus, Johannes
 Chevallon, Claude: 189
 Christianus II (Danus): 252
 Chrysostomus, Johannes: 26
 Ciao di Pagolo Ciai: 7
 Cicero: 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 15, 25, 26, 27, 33-38, 40, 41, 43-46, 48, 49, 50, 55, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 66, 70, 71, 79-114, 182, 183, 184, 197, 204
 Cincius de Rusticis: 14
 Ciriacus Anconitanus: 22
 Claudianus: 104, 105, 118, 120, 155
 Clemens VII P.M.: 248
 Clericus, Petrus: 248
 Clichthoveus, Jodocus: 187
 Cochlaeus, Johannes: 272
 Coelius, Nicolaus: 251
 Coelius, Georgius: 251
 Coellius, G.: 107
 Contarenus, Franciscus: 21, 22
 Corner, Pietro: 12
 Cornerus, Ch.: 112
 Cortesius, Paulus: 70, 96, 182, 210
 Corvinus, Laurentius: 100
 Crinitus, Petrus: 240
 Crucius, Levinus: 181
 Curlo, Giacomo: 4
 Curtius, Quintus: 55, 58, 101
 Cydones, Demetrius: 11
 Dalberg, Johannes a: 88, 91, 98
 Damasus: 196
 Damiani, Petrus: 148
 Dantiscus, Johannes: 248, 249
 Datus, Augustinus: 96, 175, 187, 204
 Demetrius (*Andreae Chrysobergis discipulus*, ca. 1425): 11
 Demosthenes: 26, 183
 Despauterius, Johannes: 175-210
 Diomedes: 135, 186
 Dircz: *vide* Harius
 Dolabella, Publius Cornelius: 197
 Domenicis, Dominicus de (*episcopus Brixianus*): 18, 19
 Donatus: 84, 186, 241
 Dorpius, Martinus: 171
 Dracontius: 129
 Dringenberg, Ludovicus: 92
 Eber, P.: 112
 Egmond, Georgius, Ab (*episcopus Ultraecinus*): 254
 Ennodius: 158
 Epistates (Probst), A.: 107
Epistulae obscurorum virorum: 193
 Erasmus: 32, 38, 42, 71, 87, 98, 113, 115-174, 175-210, 241, 249, 250, 251, 254, 256-261
 Ernst, Hans: 86
 Eugenius IV, P.M.: 13, 14, 15
 Euripides: 137, 168, 186
 Eusebius Caesarensis: 25
 Eusebius (*pater S. Hieronymi*): 195, 196
 Eustachius (*episcopus Corcyraeus*, 1428): 14
 Eutropius: 48
 Everaerts: *vide* Grudius Nicolaus; Marius Hadrianus; Secundus Janus
 Eyb, Albrecht von -: 84, 85, 86, 87, 96, 110
 Facius, Bartholomaeus: 11, 53, 61, 62, 64
 Ferdinandus *Aragoniae Rex*: 30
 Ferrarius, Speratus: 253
 Ficinus, Marsilius: 170, 187, 197
 Filelfo: *vide* Philephus
 Floccus (Fiocchi), Andreas: 7, 14
 Fisher, Robert: 177, 178, 183
 Florus (*historicus Romanus*): 101
 Florus Lugdunensis: 129
 Freigius, Thomas: 112

- Freire, Didacus: 247
 Fronto: 37
 Frulovisiis, Titus Livius de: 15, 16
 Fulgentius Planciades: 105
- Gaguinus, Robertus: 153, 154, 187, 197
 Gaza, Theodorus: 183
 Gallus, Iodocus: 95
 Gansfort, Wessel: 265
 Garcaeus, J: 112
 Gattinaria, Mercurius: 249
 Gellius, Aulus: 104, 206
 Georgius Trapezuntius: 14, 106
 Gigli Silvestro: 256-257
 Giovanni da Pavia: 12
 Giustiniani, Leonardo: 4, 27
 Goclenius, Conradus: 246, 247
 Gombert, Nicolas: 249
 Grapheus, Cornelius: 199
 Gresemundus, Theodoricus: 94
 Grudius, Nicolaus: 246, 254
 Gualterus de Castellione: 118
 Guarini, Baptista: 88
 Guarini, Guarinus: 5, 14, 21, 85, 88
 Gundel, Philippus: 108
- Haloinus, Georgius: 181, 185
 Hammius, J.: 259
 Harius, Jan: 249
 Haro, Francisca de -: 247
 Haye, Corneille de la -: 253
 Hegendorffinus, Christophorus: 98, 108
 Hegius, Alexander: 91
 Heinsius, Daniël: 213
 Heinsius, Nicolaus: 213
 Hemmerlin, *vide*: Malleolus
 Henricus VII, *rex Angliae*: 256
 Herbouts, Adrian: 200
ad Herennium: 37, 60
 Hermans, Gulielmus (Goudanus): 142, 155, 257
 Hieronymus: 25, 94, 164, 183, 193, 195, 196
 Hilarius Pictaviensis: 33
 Hillenius, Michael: 191
 Hogenberg, Nicolaus: 248
- Homerus: 209
 Horatius: 94, 97, 101, 104, 105, 124, 153, 198, 255, 256
 Hrabanus, Maurus: 161
 Hugualdus: 241
Hymni varii (Mone): 149
- Inghiramus, Thomas Phaedra: 211-219-243
 Innocentius VIII, P.M.: 18, 20
 Isabella Austriaca: 252
 Iohannes III, *Rex Portugalliae*: 253
 Iohannes, *filius Christiani II regis Daniae*: 252
 Iohannes de Lubech: 18
 Iontus Oliverius de Monte Gallo: 259-262
 Iovialis: 234
- Julius II P.M.: 257-258
 Junius, Melchior: 110, 111, 112
 Justinus *epitomator*: 26, 55, 101
 Juvenalis: 95, 97, 146, 252
 Juvencus: 26, 136
- Karoch, Samuel: 84, 100
 Keckermann, Bartholomeus: 111, 112
 Ketelle, A.: 259
 Kitscher, Friedrich von -: 107
 Knöringen, Christoph von -: 104
 Koetterle, Blasius: 106
- Lactantius: 87, 94, 101, 102
 Laetus, Pomponius: 211, 212, 213, 217, 218
 Landinus, Christophorus: 122
 Langius, Johannes Erfordianus: 194
 Langius, Johannes Leopoltitanus: 194
 Langius, Mattheus: 194
 Langius, Rudolphus: 88, 194
 Languschis, Iacobus de: 1-29
 Lapo da Castiglionchio: 14
 Latomus, Bartholomaeus: 91, 108, 113
 Lenicerus, Albertus: 109, 110
 Leo X P.M.: 257
 Leonardi, Niccolò: 14
 Leonardus Chius: 16

- Leupa, Johannes: 181
 Livius, Titus: 25, 30, 35-40, 42, 43, 45, 46,
 53-58, 61, 70, 71, 102
 Locher, Jacobus: 84, 98, 100, 103, 104,
 105, 106, 107
 Longolius, Christophorus: 184
 Longus, Martinus: 15
 Lotter, M.: 107
 Lucanus: 94, 104, 118, 132, 136, 160
 Lucianus: 186
 Lucretius: 36
 Luder, Petrus: 84-87, 107
 Lullus, Raimundus: 19, 20
 Luna, Nicolaus: 8, 9, 12
 Lupftich, Johannes: 104
 Lupset, Thomas: 184
 Luschus (Loschi), Antonius: 82, 105

 Macrobius: 86, 106
 Macropedius, Georgius: 182, 267-268
 Maeonides: *vide* Homerus
 Mair, M.: 98
 Malleolus (Hemmerlin), Paulus, Andelo-
 censis: 194
 Mancinellus, Antonius: 175, 187, 194
 Manettus, Iannotius: 6, 8, 9, 25, 26
 Manlius, Henricus: 197
 Mantuanus, Baptista: 122, 190, 191
 Manutius, Paulus: 112
 Marchantius, Jacobus: 259
 Margaretha ab Austria: 247, 248
 Marinus, Sanudus: 17
 Marius Hadrianus: 246
 Martialis: 95, 137, 171, 191, 252, 253
 Martinus V, P.M.: 3, 14, 15
 Marullus, Michael: 122
 Mascarenhas, Pedro: 247, 251, 252, 253,
 254
 Mayaert, Lucas: 260
 Mayaert, Willem: 260
 Mediceus Averardus: 7
 Mediceus, Cosmus: 4, 7, 14, 15, 25, 26
 Mediceus, Franciscus: 7
 Mediceus, Iulianus Averardi filius: 6, 7, 8,
 9
 Mediceus, Iulianus: 3
 Mediceus, Laurentius: 7
 Mediceus, Pierus: 6, 8, 26, 182
 Mela, Pomponius: 27
 Melanchthon, Philippus: 89, 108
 Misotis, Redolfus Johannes: 27
 Monacensis, Wolfgangus: 107
 Monetarius, Hieronymus: 312
 Montanus, Godofridus: 257
 Montanus, Paulus: 188, 196
 Morosini, Francesco: 15, 18
 Mortier, Hieronymus du: 259
 Morus, Philippus: 259
 Morus Thomas: 259, 261
 Murmellius, Johannes: 91
 Mutianus, Conradus: 97
 Mylius, Arnoldus: 244

 Naevius, Johannes: 188, 196
 Nemesianus: 120
 Nemius, Johannes: 182
 Niavis, Petrus: 98, 107
 Niccoli, Niccolò: 3, 4, 5, 7, 14, 25
 Nicolaus V, P.M.: 13
 Nicolaus Bibranus: 84
 Nicolaus, Bartholomaeus: 186
 Niger, Franciscus: 96, 103, 175, 187
 Notker, Petrus de Windelsheim: 107
 Northoff, Henricus: 183

 Ockegem, Johannes: 148
 Orsini: *vide* Ursinus
 Otho, Daniel: 260
 Otho, Johannes: 260
 Othonia, Johanna: 259, 260
 Ovidius: 95, 97, 104, 118, 119, 120, 121,
 145, 154, 170, 171

 Panormita, Antonius: 13, 14, 15
 Paulinus Aquileiensis: 136
 Paulinus Nolanus: 161
 Paulus Middelburgensis: 18
 Perottus, Nicolaus: 175, 187, 194
 Persius: 101, 104, 201
 Petrarca, Franciscus: 51, 82, 86, 122
 Petronius: 47
 Peuerbach, Georgius: 84
 Pflug, Julius: 39, 42
 Phaedra (Phaedrus): *vide* Inghiramus

- Philelphus Franciscus: 8, 11, 14, 85
 Piccolomini, Jacobus Ammannati, (*cardinalis Papiensis*): 198
 Picus Mirandulanus Iohannes: 193, 197
 Picus Mirandulanus Iohannes Franciscus: 184, 187, 197
 Pileo dei Marini: 9
 Pisanus, Victor: 106
 Pius II, P.M.: *vide* Aeneas Silvius
 Pius, Johannes Baptista: 103
 Pizolpassus, Franciscus: 6
 Platina, Bartholomaeus: 64
 Plato: 3, 10, 25, 26
 Plautus: 86, 94, 104, 122, 183
 Plienigen: *vide* Plinius
 Plinius (Plienigen) Johannes: 88
 Plinius (Plienigen) Theodoricus: 88, 91, 92
 Plinius maior: 104, 105; minor: 105, 183
 Plotius, Marius: 135
 Plutarchus: 27, 90
 Poggius, Iohannes Baptista: 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 14, 25, 27, 34, 45, 51, 61, 82, 86, 183
 Politianus, Angelus: 61, 96, 121, 182, 183, 184, 187, 197, 210, 214, 215, 216, 219-221, 223, 224, 226-228, 231-235, 237-241, 243
 Polybius: 9
 Polydorus, Vergilius: 209, 255
 Pontanus, Iohannes Iovianus: 183
 Pontanus, Petrus: 176, 189, 190, 191
 Porcarius, Stephanus: 14
 Porcellius, Iacobus: 13, 15
 Portinari, Bernardo: 25
 Proba: 26
 Probst: *vide* Epistates
 Propertius: 104, 115, 126, 191
 Prudentius: 124, 134, 138, 140, 149, 162
 Publicius (Rufus), Iacobus: 83
 Quintilianus: 26, 32, 33, 34, 36, 59, 69, 88, 89, 92, 94, 101, 106, 186
 Ramus, Petrus: 112, 113
 Raudensis, Antonius: 47, 48
 Regiomontanus, Johannes: 84
 Regius, Ludovicus: (*de Imola*) 21
 Regius (Leroy), Ludovicus: 21
 Regius Corneliensis, Ludovicus: 21
 Reich: *vide* Riccius, St.
 Resendius, Lucius Angelus Andreas: 244-254
 Rhenanus, Beatus: 177
 Rhodolphus, Ch.: 91
 Riccius (Reich), St.: 107
 Ricus (Ricci), Nicolaus: 6, 25
 Riederer, Friedrich: 92
 Rīgus, Ludovicus: 19, 20, 21
 Rontus, Mattheus: 21
 Roselli, Antonius: 14
 Rufinus: 183
 Sabellicus, Marcus Antonius: 70
 Salerno, Giannicola: 7
 Sallustius: 8, 33, 35-39, 41, 42, 45, 48, 53-58, 60, 61, 67, 68, 70, 71, 92, 94, 183
 Salutatus, Coluccius: 51
 Sanderus, Antonius: 259
 Scala, Bartholomaeus: 183
 Scaliger, Justus Joseph: 213
 Schneevogel: *vide* Niavis
 Schottus, Andreas: 244
 Schürer, Matthias: 189
 Scribonius, Cornelius: 199
 Secundinus, Nicolaus: 16
 Secundus, Johannes: 244-254
 Sedulius, Caelius: 129
 Sedulius Scottus: 144
 Seneca, *philosophus et tragicus*: 94, 97, 102, 104, 105, 136, 173, 183
 Servius: 7, 118, 135
 Sigismundus I: 248
 Silius Italicus: 119, 121, 140
 Simon de Phares: 19
 Sluperius, Iacobus: 259
 Sophronius: 195, 196
 Soranzo, Vettor: 211
 Statius: 69, 97, 118, 121, 133, 140, 184, 207
 Stephanus de Flandria: 259-262
 Stoeckel: *vide* Monacensis, W.
 Strozza, Hercules: 211, 218
 Struver, H.: 109
 Sturm, Johannes: 108, 109, 110
 Sucquetus, Carolus: 248

- Suetonius: 4, 26, 41, 54, 55, 66, 106, 191
 Sulpitius, Johannes: 175, 187, 204
 Surigonus Stephanus: 255

 Tacitus: 36-39, 45, 54, 55, 58, 67
 Tanaglia: 25
 Tegrinus, Nicolaus: 257-258
 Terentius: 94, 104, 183, 211-243
 Tertullianus: 37
 Thanner, J.: 107
 Thucydides: 57
 Tibullus: 104, 118, 191
 Torrentinus, Hermannus: 186, 191
 Tortellius, Iohannes: 2, 3, 5, 6
 Transsylvanus, Maximilianus: 247
 Traversarius, Ambrosius: 5, 14
 Tulichius, H.: 107, 108, 109
 Tutor, Jacobus: 188, 196, 200

 Ursinus, Fulvius: 212

 Valerius Flaccus: 121, 169
 Valerius Maximus: 94, 104, 106
 Valla, Laurentius: 14, 30-78, 89, 102, 183, 186
 Varro: 33
 Vasco da Gama: 251
 Velleius Paterculus: 58
 Vellutellius Guglielmus: 259, 262
 Venantius Fortunatus: 122, 124, 136
 Vergenhans, Johannes: 101
 Vergenhans, Ludwig: 101
 Vergerius, Petrus Paulus: 14, 15
 Vergilius: 40, 49, 94, 97, 101, 102, 104, 118, 119, 120, 122, 126, 130, 136, 140, 142, 158, 173, 211-215, 217
 Vespasiano da Bisticci: 8
 Vicente Gil: 252
 Victorinus, Feltrensis: 85
 Victorinus, Marius: 135
 Vieri, Nicola di -: 7
 Viglius al Aytta: 259
 Virgilius: *vide* Polydorus
 Virulus, Carolus: 180
 Visorius, J.: 91
 Vitellius, Cornelius: 255
 Vitruvius: 21, 86
 Vives, Johannes Ludovicus: 98
 de Voecht, Jacob: *vide* Tutor
 Volcardus, Gerardus: 259, 260
Vulgata: 136, 145

 Wimpfeling, Jacobus: 80, 84, 91-96, 99, 102, 104, 110
 Wood, Anthony à: 255

 Yetzweirtius, Jacobus: 269-271
 Ysebrant, Antony: 200

 Zarotto, Antonio: 214
 Zasius, Udalricus: 104

HUMANISTICA LOVANIENSIA
(JOURNAL OF NEO-LATIN STUDIES)

Ed. Prof. Dr. J. IJSEWIJN

Volume XVII,	1968, 162 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XVIII,	1969, 164 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XIX,	1979, 514 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XX,	1971, 297 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XXI,	1972, 412 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XXII,	1973, 341 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XXIII,	1974, 441 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XXIV,	1975, 376 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XXV,	1976, 306 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XXVI,	1977, 280 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XXVII,	1978, 366 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XXVIII,	1979, 386 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XXIX,	1980, 353 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XXX,	1981, 278 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XXXI,	1982, 256 p. — 1200 fr.
Volume XXXII,	1983, 471 p. — 2300 fr.
Volume XXXII,	1984, 366 p. — 2300 fr.
Volume XXXIV,	1985, 513 p. — 2300 fr.
Volume XXXV,	1986, 336 p. — 2300 fr.
Volume XXXVI,	1987, 358 p. — 2300 fr.

SUPPLEMENTA HUMANISTICA LOVANIENSIA

1. *Iohannis Harmonii Marsi De rebus italicis deque triumpho Ludovici XII regis Francorum Tragoedia*, ed. G. TOURNOY, 1978. 320 fr.
2. *Charisterium H. De Vocht 1878-1978*, ed. J. IJSEWIJN & J. ROEGIERS, 1979. 350 fr.
3. *Judocus J.C.A. Crabeels. Odae Iscanae. Schuttersfeest te Overijse (1781)*, ed. J. IJSEWIJN, G. VANDE PUTTE & R. DENAYER, 1981. 320 fr.
4. *Erasmiana Lovaniensia. Cataloog van de Tentoonstelling, Universiteitsbibliotheek Leuven, november 1986 (1986)*. 1200 fr.